

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I'm am excited to see the data after the trial run on these particular units. I do wonder if excluding the youth from the antler point restrictions is worth evaluating

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I strongly support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders. I believe that has become less of a unique traditional hunt and more of a single shot ALW hunt.

I would really like to see the technology committee consider an archery ethics course as well. Possibly even considering a shooting test for archers. I think it would reduce wounded game

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I like the mandatory harvest reporting so I'd like to see this go through. The other items such as a monetary penalty I have no strong opinion on but would support whatever is decided.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I'm am strongly opposed to taking scopes off muzzleloaders. The fact that there are recommendations being based on 639 people put of the immense amount of hunters is absolutely absurd. You're also basing these recommendations off of harvest rates that you're guessing on since harvest reporting isn't mandatory. I would possibly support going back to a 1x scope but I would not support going to open sights or peep sights. If the harvest of deer hasn't changed much according to your data, then why make the change? This seems like you are making this change to appease a very small but vocal minority that is screaming about muzzleloader scopes. Too many people have vision issues that don't allow for the use of open sights. Scopes alleviate that issue immensely. A 1x scope should be the minimum to allow those older people and people with poor vision to use a muzzleloader instead of using a rifle. We should be keeping things as is or at the very most changing to a 1x or holographic sight open. Visual impairment COR would not be approved for someone based on bad vision so this is not an option. Everyone knows this would only be approved for people who have a severe disability and an aging person would never be considered to have a disability to qualify for this.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** These are general season units. If people want to trophy hunt, we have limited entry units for them to do so. We need to quit restricting hunters for a small number to chase trophies.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I fully support harvest reporting. We have got to get better data. This is a great step in that direction.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I fully support the 4 point or better idea on Pine Valley and would like to see it expanded once it proves successful. I grew up hunting Fishlake when it was 3 point or better. It was phenomenal. That all changed when the slaughtered the bucks the year it went to any buck. The difference was night and day.

I'm not in support of the shortened archery season on the other units. Bow hunters do not prove to be relevant in regards to harvest percentage. Shortening the seasons on just about any hunt typically increase pressure and often times increase harvest as people make a point to hit it harder with a shorter season.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This muzzleloader scope recommendation is ridiculous. Just a few short years ago you explained to us that scopes would not be a problem. Now they are? Rifle hunters kill more deer than muzzleloaders and archers combined. (Look it up if you don't believe me). If the goal is to reduce harvest on our herds you need to address it on the rifle hunt. If the goal of this recommendation is to make the muzzleloader hunt tougher then you need to look at other options. There are a lot of people who suffer from being far sighted like myself. I can see great at distance but up close I can't see well enough to read my phone without "readers" on. If I wear my readers to shoot with an open sight I can't see the target down range. I could stomach this change a whole lot more if you would at least reset the regs back to what it used to be. A 1x scope or red dot is not awesome in any way shape or form. As a matter of fact they are worse than open sights if you have corrected vision but for me and the many far sighted hunters out there they make it so we can still use our muzzleloaders as a viable weapon. Please don't take this hunt away from me by removing scopes completely. It is unnecessary and problematic for a lot of us who love to hunt with a muzzy. I do not feel like it is unreasonable to pump the brakes on this drastic change. You could do a lot more ACROSS THE BOARD by banning rangefinders on all hunts.

As I recall this committee was tasked with "emerging technologies". Rather than target the muzzleloader scopes they should look into what has emerged recently: Ignition systems, smokeless powder muzzleloaders, Powder charges over 100 grains, scopes over 9 or 12 power.

The muzzy everyone is so worked up about are the Long range guns that could be eliminated by banning scopes over 9 power and smokeless powders. Don't ban the lower variable scopes to eliminate the LR guns.

If you truly want to reduce harvest leave everything as is and ban rangefinders. That would significantly reduce harvest and 1/3 of the hunters wouldn't have to complete change their set up (again).

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I like the idea of the shortened seasons. I think this is something that we need to look at and do throughout the whole state of Utah if it happens to work on the units that they've chosen to try it out on.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Leave the muzzleloaders alone do not take scopes off of them. It makes no sense to cripple the muzzleloader hunters only to give the rifle hunters more opportunity to shoot over 1000 yards.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** We should have never boxed up and shipped out pronghorn to other states from the plateau to begin with. I hope someone smarter than the current biologists is taking notes on what happens when we transplant animals from an area. The populations crash, tag numbers are severely cut and opportunities are lost for all, for many years, if they ever come back at all. Willard, plateau and many moose units are great examples of this.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** It's as if we have completely abandoned the idea of trying to grow more deer statewide, and instead we are trying to severely limit success of hunters on what little numbers of deer we have left. "Here's a tag, but we don't expect or want you to fill it. Thanks for your money though." Come on, we can do better than this.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The newly obtained data from your "survey" does not support or warrant the new recommendations. That is even admitted in the video. I fully support limitations on magnified scopes, but we are trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist. Allow a 4x maximum scope. That severely limits any long range shots, but allows for ethical and precise shots to be taken, reducing the wound/loss issues.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

No CWMU should be allowed to hunt ANY public land. I don't care if the public land is land locked. It's not their property, they should not be allowed to use it like it's their property for private hunting purposes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Like many middle age and older folks my aging eyes struggle to utilize open or peep sights. I don't understand the need for picking on the older muzzy hunters : ) I've witnessed more issues with rifle hunters attempting 1000 yard shots and wounding animals, archery hunters attempting 80-90 yard shots and wounding animals. How about looking at the real issue which is laser rangefinders. Eliminate their use and you equally affect all three weapon types, you will see success drop, and you affect everyone, not just one group. If the division is [REDACTED] on targeting just muzzleloaders at least take it back to the way it was where 1X scopes are allowed. Bottom line, the rule change as it is being proposed discriminates against older hunters making it difficult to impossible to continue to enjoy the muzzy hunt. (and yes I know you can obtain a COR, which I will do... However, that becomes an enforcement nightmare for your law enforcement section with all the complaints called in by people reporting folks with COR's hunting with a scope etc)

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Your own surveys revealed that increase in harvest was minimal, there wasn't support to change anything but yet you decide what hunters want. Your data does not support that hunters want to remove scopes from muzzleloaders. "The Division want" its not about what you want its what the hunters want and the data supports that hunters want scopes and at the very least aren't against them.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I disagree with the decision to require that muzzleloaders have only open sights. As the data you presented indicated, there has been no change in harvest success, wounding, etc... since adding scopes several years ago. If adding scopes has not changed anything then why do we need to change back? The video mentioned the need to have muzzleloader hunts be distinct from any legal weapon hunts. It seems that requiring a gun that loads a single shot from the muzzle is distinction enough. These muzzleloader hunts are difficult enough due to the time of year and the short range (most of us as the data indicates are not able to make longer than 200 yard shots) and single shot of the muzzleloader. Removing scopes is only going to make it even more difficult and lead to more poor shots. I think if these changes are made you will be removing an opportunity for many hunters to enjoy the thrill of muzzleloading by making it even more challenging and difficult than it already is. The data you shared also does not support this change! Just because everyone else is doing it doesn't mean we should follow along without data to support the decision!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Per the memorandum:

He states the 3 purposes of the committee are: 1 to preserve hunting traditions. 2. Help managers meet objectives. 3. Increase opportunity. This proposal does not help those 3 purposes. First, the success rates have only gone up 2.6% since scopes were allowed back in 2016. Public opinion does not support this recommendation. - Only ~28% of muzzleloader hunters support open sights. Only ~27% of all surveyed Opposed keeping things Status Quo.

Muzzleloader Data: NO significant changes over the last 10 years in deer and elk hunters.  
~75% do not support or are neutral to a change.

Key takeaways- He says there is some support to keep things as they are. But his data show there is overwhelming support to keep the status quo.

Propose to keep watching success rates, if success rates go up significantly then revisit the need for change.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Thank you for making reporting mandatory.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I like that you are proposing to study the effects of these hunt strategies. However, I do not like that you are proposing several new hunt strategies that are outside of the sideboards of the Mule Deer Management Plan. You use the plan to justify not doing other things, but ignore the plan when it is something that you want to do. The plan is redone next year. Let the new plan be created before proposing a bunch of new strategies. If this recommendation does pass, please do a good job studying the outcomes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** This presentation by Mr. Blair was very misleading. When summarizing the survey results, he repeatedly lumped the neutral votes with the side of the argument that he wanted to make. If we evenly split the neutral votes between both sides, then both survey questions (1-should we remove scopes and 2-should we keep things status quo) are 66% keep scopes and 66% keep things status quo. Two to one--not about 50%. This is very misleading! I have been trying to wrap my head around this recommendation--most hunters don't want scopes removed, scopes have not altered success (2% difference is well within the error surrounding the estimate and even if true, just means they will not get killed 3 weeks later in the rifle hunt), and there is no biological effect. This seems like a completely bogus recommendation based on somebody's personal vendetta against muzzleloader hunters. I am 100% opposed to this recommendation. If you want to do something meaningful, get rid of rangefinders so that everyone (bowhunters, muzzleloader hunters, and rifle hunters) is equally affected.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I would like more information on some of the changes. You state in passing that none of the acreage changes are big enough to warrant permit changes on one of the slides. However, you show that the Golden Spike CWMU decreases in size by 5100 acres or 8 square miles. This seems like a quite large change in acreage to me. What proportion of the CWMU is 5100 acres? Why no change in tags?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Reporting - make it available on the DWR app.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I agree with the study in regard to reducing the hunting days. Let's try and see what the results are. It would be a little less pressure and stress on the animals.

The DWR has already tried antler restriction and did not like the results.

With weapon restrictions, the hunters who are against this and traditionally put in for these units will just hunt elsewhere. Most rifles do not have open sights on them, so hunters will now need to purchase another gun to gun these units

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Make the online reporting available through the DWR app.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am interested to see how this affects hunting in Utah, I'm not against antler point restrictions but I wonder about the affects it will have on genetics and finding more mature deer, while I'm ok with somewhat short seasons I really feel like 5 days is shorter than I would like it but I'm not totally opposed depending on the exact dates, I'm predominantly an archery hunter because of how hard it is to draw a rifle tag and don't plan on going back but I hope this does help the deer population and provides more opportunities, maybe with shorter seasons they can split it into 2 shorter seasons and spread out the hunters (not at all like the new elk otc tag please), I do not like the restrictions on compound bow's however, I would be interested in seeing a season dedicated to more traditional archery hunting but also keep the compound bow season as well, maybe shorten the season a few days and overlap the season? Traditional season starting a few days before and going for 3 weeks or so and then a compound season starting as I said a few days to a week later and letting it run to the same end date or extend it a few days

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I do not think muzzleloaders should have scopes at all and should be separate from the alw hunt as much as possible, I also think as far as rifle hunting maybe looking into a scope restriction such as only allowing a 3-9 power scope, I honestly don't agree with shooting any animal over 350 yards or so and don't think you need anything more powerful to make that happen

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I'm planning on getting into the dedicated hunter program starting this year and I believe changing the hours to 6 for the first year is more manageable, I have no real opinion on changing the orientation course as I have not ever taken it yet but understand it will probably be more streamlined and simple while applying for the tag, I like that I can submit my harvest online and don't have to return the paper tag to a location.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Sort of confused, but if it allows the landowners to hunt their own land and allows the public a few more tags because of it then I am all in favor, and if it allows me to hunt private land, (I'm assuming with a specific tag not just a general tag?) then I'm in favor of more land available to hunt as well

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** I have never heard of an LOA before I would like to learn more about this program and how it affects the public

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** My ONLY concern/thought when it comes to CWMU is being able to filter and sort through all of the units to better decide what one to put in for, it seems like it takes hours to check success rates and as well as draw odds and then to check all the rules and some of them have websites with different rules than on the DWR website, also are we allowed to hunt only 5 days in the units or a minimum of 5 days, and do we get to pick the dates or get them assigned to us, some of the CWMU websites seem to say differently from what I have heard about the program so having a dedicated page to this program would help tremendously!!

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 11:40 am

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

in 2016 it was decided to allow any powered scopes on muzzleloaders, and now its been put fourth to outlaw scopes on muzzleloaders all together. pretty much saying well will decided to let you use these and now you have spent money on guns and optics and have or should have put time in learning how to use it. You can no longer use it that way and was all for nothing. WHY? I never really heard the why other then that's is what the committee has recommended to limit "technology" Lets go over some of your points made in the video.

go to open sight only non muzzy hunters 39% opposed 41% for, Muzzy+ 60% opposed 28% for, Muzzy only 56% opposed 29% for.

Limit to 1x scopes only - most where against this as am I , I would rather shot open/peep sights over a 1x scope.

No changes at all - Non muzzy hunters 39% for NO change 27% for, Muzzy + 57% NO change 25% for, Muzzy only 53% No change 28% for. Most folks in the survey was for making NO changes.

Listen to the people! It sounds like most want the scopes and who cares what other states are doing our concern should be with Utah only not what the neighbor is doing.

People not conferrable shooting 200 yds. and taking longer shots them they should because of the scope (technology) - to make a statement stating that if someone has the technology to shot at long distances and that is going to cause them to take shots they shouldn't is an under statement for ANY form of hunting. every year hunters take shots they shouldn't due to knowing their equipment can make the shot, But can they as an individual? it dose not matter if we talk archery, muzzleloader, rifle, and even water fowl or turkey people take longer shots then they or even their equipment should be taking every year. examples you could hear - the tape on my bows adjustable sight goes out the 130 yds., the scope on my rifle/muzzy can dial out to 1200 yds., Man those birds are high but with this extended range choke and 3 1/3 inch mag I might reach them. It comes down to hunting ethics knowing ones limitations and not taking a shot you shouldn't.

so again Why go back to no scopes? to limit technology? to make muzzleloader hunting unique? you are still using a firearm that you half to dump powder down the bore followed by ramming a bullet, ball, or sabot down the bore, and placing a cap or primer on the breach to fire it. Then you get one shot with no super fast fallow up shot. So why would you not want a scope. And if some on wants to do it traditional, there is nothing stopping them from picking up a Hawkins 50 with patch and ball and going for it. Just because you can use a scope dose not mean you half to!

there is probably no form of hunting that has been or had more technical advancements then archery hunting. everything the bow, arrows sights,

broadheads, releases, and everything in between has been made lighter, faster, stronger, more efficient for the bow hunter. And the archery equipment used today is a far cry from traditional archery equipment. But you are still just knocking an arrow to string and flinging it through the air.

I agree there needs to be a line somewhere but where and how do you draw that line. the definition of hunting varies from person to person. One person wants to sit in a stand another thinks spot and stalk is the only way and yet another wants to snip from a long distance. Banning scopes only targets/ focuses on one of those because of the "technology" he uses.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I personally think getting a "pretty good" response rate of 25% of people you sent a survey to isn't an accurate reflection of how the general hunting population truly feels. Based on what I am seeing online and in forums it appears to be completely opposite. Eliminating variable or fixed power scope is useless. You are going to end up with everyone shooting a little fork buck and it won't allow for mature mule deer. All it's going to do is create more road hunters. Based on prior success rates having a fixed or variable scope doesn't necessarily increase your odds of taking a buck. It's not allowing much more of an increase in big game to be taken. If that is the case, why eliminate them? We personally enjoy the muzzleloader hunt each year as a family. My daughter is 15 and took her first buck last year with a muzzleloader. My daughter is confident in her ability to hunt and take an ethical shot with a scope, not open sights. She has said she will stop going on the muzzleloader hunt if there isn't a scope on the gun. We hate the rifle deer hunt because of how overcrowded it is and it's later in year. So those that want to make sure they are taking an ethical shot with a scope on a muzzleloader can just go hunt elsewhere? This would ruin this for my daughter, my family and many other youth hunters that I know. Utah used to be an amazing place to hunt, but it keeps going downhill each year.

Just think of this one thing... Ethical kill shots. The last thing we as hunters want is to wound an animal. It's awful! The variable or fixed sights allow for a more ethical shot and I'd bet wounds FAR LESS animals. Are we doing right by the animal we are trying to harvest? NOPE. Let's send folks out with open sights or peep sights... great idea. I cringe hearing the stories my father-in-law tells about the days he would muzzleload hunt. It's basically "I was [REDACTED] lucky if I hit a deer at fifty yards. I more than wounded my fair share."

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In the surveys, if you disregard the people who voted as neutral, it's clear that a majority of people don't support the changes of taking away scopes. The data also shows that success has not increased significantly, and public comment shows that people are not taking these long shots that people are concerned with. So based on those factors, why is there a need to change the rule? It seems that the division is choosing a recommendation that is not supported by the public survey. I also feel that taking away scopes will greatly affect people with eyesight problems. For example, my 55 year old dad has significant vision problems and shooting an open sight muzzleloader is very challenging because he can't focus the rear sight to the front sight. This restriction would limit his ability to hunt with a muzzleloader. I also feel like the division is attempting to make it harder and harder for hunters to be successful. Is it the goal of the division to not have me harvest an animal when I have a permit in my pocket or is the goal to give hunters everything possible to be successful in their hunt? I fail to see why we should be limiting hunters effectiveness with a weapon to make them less successful when they have a permit in their pocket. I also feel frustrated that muzzleloaders are being targeted but there is nothing about archery. Slider sights, range finders, compound bows are all not considered traditional, but nothing is recommended regarding those. And I'm sure that wounded animals is by far the highest during the archery hunts than any other hunt. However, I don't think those items should be restricted in an attempt to make hunters less successful. I feel that if a hunter has a tag in their pocket, they should be given the best chances of harvesting that animal. If we are worried about hunters being too effective, then we need to limit the amount of tags we give out. I just think the division recommendation is silly and isn't what the majority of the public want.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 2:48 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** What does it matter if you have a scope on your muzzle loader? This is still America, freedom of choice. Utah and Arizona have it right!

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 3:04 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 3:07 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** According to my research the harvest rate for both deer and elk has been minimal since allowing scopes on muzzleloaders. I think it is much more ethical and humane for the vast majority of muzzleloader hunters. I say keep scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I agree with the survey results about keeping muzzleloaders. Why would you go against what the population is asking for. I understand trying to keep it different but is a variable scope really changing what the muzzleloader is. It's already harder than any legal weapon since you can only fire once without a longer reload time. At the very least, you should keep it at a non variable scope to allow better shot placement to reduce wounding, but again I don't understand going against your own survey.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I strongly, strongly, strongly agree! With advances in technology it's almost unfair to the animals. Some will say "Bad shots will be taken." Ethical hunter, which I believe most of us are, will not take shots outside of our abilities.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Almost all hunters should agree that land owner tags should only be used on the land that is privately owned. This has been a hot topic and seems unfair that a land owner tag can be used unit wide. If the tag is issued to compensate for damage caused by animals to the private land then taking an animal outside the private land does not solve the problem. This has become a money grab for land owners and I would like to see a study done on how many animals are taken not on the land owned by the persons receiving land owner tags.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** But allow a red dot site

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Do the research in units mentioned but do a state wide antler restriction for 4 point or better on one side with the exception of youth 12 to 16 or 18 they may take any buck I think this would increase the chance at better bucks and allows the youth to get the experience to shoot a young buck if wanted I know I'm one person but you guys need to actually listen this time to peoples opinion like you are wanting please do this for 2024 thanks for reading this and hope you make this decision to only allow youth to shoot a buck smaller then a 4 point on one side and restrict adults too a four on atleast one side

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Allow red dot sites on muzzloader

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I suggest we cut tags drastically due to last years winter kill. This winter shaping up to be like last years. Antler restriction statewide 3/4 point or better. Leave muzzy's alone. It's still a primitive weapon whether or not they have scopes, scopes make for a more ethical shot. Get rid of the trail cam restriction, I have yet to see the evidence that it aids in taking more game. Also would like to add that most of us that are in dedicated should get another year due to the rule change. I had a harvest counted against me cause I didn't turn in my tag. Now you can report it online?

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Cut tags drastically due to last years winter kill. This winter shaping up to be like last years. Antler restriction statewide 3/4 point or better. Leave muzzy's alone. It's still a primitive weapon whether or not they have scopes, scopes make for a more ethical shot. Get rid of the trail cam restriction, I have yet to see the evidence that it aids in taking more game. Also would like to add that most of us that are in dedicated should get another year due to the rule change. I had a harvest counted against me cause I didn't turn in my tag. Now you can report it online?

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Cut tags drastically due to last years winter kill. This winter shaping up to be like last years. Antler restriction statewide 3/4 point or better. Leave muzzy's alone. It's still a primitive weapon whether or not they have scopes, scopes make for a more ethical shot. Get rid of the trail cam restriction, I have yet to see the evidence that it aids in taking more game. Also would like to add that most of us that are in dedicated should get another year due to the rule change. I had a harvest counted against me cause I didn't turn in my tag. Now you can report it online?

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Cut tags drastically due to last years winter kill. This winter shaping up to be like last years. Antler restriction statewide 3/4 point or better. Leave muzzy's alone. It's still a primitive weapon whether or not they have scopes, scopes make for a more ethical shot. Get rid of the trail cam restriction, I have yet to see the evidence that it aids in taking more game. Also would like to add that most of us that are in dedicated should get another year due to the rule change. I had a harvest counted against me cause I didn't turn in my tag. Now you can report it online?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I would like to see a state wide general elk hunt with a few premium units for bulls where as the rest of the state is an otc any elk unit where you can hunt bulls with 4 points or greater on one side for 5-7 days and after that cows for 3-5 days to finish the season and a shorter season over all !! archery elk sept.1-25th or 30th and a rifle season in October only no more hunting elk for months on end a few premium late season tags for cows and bulls on very few units ... i know there is not an elk section so I just put it here thank you for the time

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Long range muzzleloaders need to end

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Every point discussed does not support the change to remove scopes. I've hunted muzzleloader my entire life over 20 years. I have a passion gorgeous longer range muzzleloader hunting. This Gove me the opportunity to shoot all summer in preparation for the hunt I'm passionate about and taking scopes take the opportunities of this type of hunting away from the 50% that enjoy scopes. Not to mention by changing this law it will make my investment worthless because I'm only able to use it here in utah with the current law. And having to use it in the ALW hunt force me to hunt with more people and diminishes my odds to draw. I highly disagree with this and all the facts like success rate and the other points talked about do NOT support this chane.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 4:52 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** 3% increase in success is negligible at best! Let people keep hunting the way they know. Most people still can't shoot over 100 yards with their scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

This proposal sounds like a specific wish of a few people and not the voice of the people. There should be more focus for kids in this proposal. My kids don't want to go hunting anymore because there are too many hunters and not enough animals. We're losing our kids to video games and cell phones! Please let's make some changes so that our kids have more opportunities to hunt and harvest big game...not just deer! Let the kids hunt multiple areas and let them hunt more dates with extended seasons. Let them hunt the smaller bull elk and the smaller deer in areas where adults with 20 plus points will only shoot trophies! We should be making sure that kids have a tag for a bull elk or a buck deer every year before they turn 18! Don't subject kids to the same restrictions as adults. We only have a few short years with them before they lose their interest.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have been muzzleloader deer hunting for 20 years and support 1-4 power scopes. No restrictions on scopes has ruined the hunt the past few years and made the hunt too popular and crowded. 1-4 power scopes is the perfect fit between Archery and Rifle. There should be more considerations for kids in this proposal. Kids need technology to help them compete with adults. If anything please don't limit our kids to no scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Decades ago you proposed Center fire rifle caliber minimums for various big game species, as do neighboring States. The public cried out that they had purchased small caliber rifles for children and female hunters and that your regulations would obsolete those weapons. Today I could legally hunt Bison (supposing I drew) with a rifle chambered in 17 Remington, firing a 20 grain varmint bullet and sporting a 8-32 power scope that, according to your groups rational, would encourage me to attempt an extremely long shot. Both an extreme and an asinine example, however, if having unrestricted power scopes on muzzleloaders hasn't caused people to wound more game why obsolete my and many other hunters investments. Allowing us to set aside our magnum rifles with high powered scopes to use our expensive muzzleloaders at a disadvantage to others hunters in an any weapon hunt makes exactly ZERO sense to me and most others. Quit trying to legislate ethics and rescind a good rule that was a Long time coming! MORE thinking out of the box, allowing more weapon makes more sense to me. If you must, why not rotate hunts from region to region with traditional weapons (that you couldn't find for sale in a Utah sporting goods store today) in one and modern in another. I used to hunt with a Thompson Center Renegade but have moved up several times with technology. Why don't you restrict archery equipment to recurve bows without sights only? I recommend you educate more on all these issues while legislating and regulating less. Teach me I would be better off using my .338 Remington Ultra Mag and fire cartridges loaded with 300-grain bonded bullets for Bison than requiring it! Thanks, Todd Ballantyne, age 61, veteran hunter and weapon expert. I had a muzzleloader general deer permit and hunted zero days this year. I had a general bull elk any bull tag and hunted for two days this season and saw the same zero elk everyone else I talked to saw while hunting the entire season. You have been loosing me for years with limited and poor opportunities. Thankfully I have hunted with far more success and enjoyment in Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, North Dakota, Kansas and Canada (and I am not rich).

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Great change thank you.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I don't hunt these units but I feel we already know what happens with antler restrictions so why bother and waste time? Let's try something different and see what we can learn. I'm good with trying shorter seasons, could be social and hunter crowding issues but I wouldn't mind trying it. I don't have an issue with limiting weapons. I like trying something new. Seems those who hunt boulder might be upset they're getting everything. Again I don't hunt these units, I'm ok with the project but if it were my unit I wouldn't like antler restrictions and crowding in shorter seasons would be concerning. I'm pretty satisfied with the way things are now.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I know multiple people taking muzzleloader shots at 500 yds. I know many who shoot at 300+ yds. At those ranges muzzleloader energy is not usually sufficient for what I consider an ethical kill. I don't think people should be shooting at animals at that distance with a muzzy. There's still good open sights that could keep people accurate at 200 yds and in which seems much more reasonable. When you get beyond that I think you get away from the point of holding a muzzleloader season. I would also support staying the same tech wise with a shorter 4 day season and adding a flintlock or reduced tech season for an additional 4 days before the other hunt opened. Overall love the fact that we're looking at this. Thank you.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I would be fine removing scopes off of muzzleloaders but moving the muzzleloader deer hunt back to November.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I would like to see some type of elk limited entry/dedicated program, example- within a 5 year period you would be allowed to harvest a spike, a cow, and a big bull within certain hunting units, and would be all for double the service hours that the deer program has.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly agree that muzzleloader technologies need to be restricted. I strongly opposed the ability to use variable power scope when that change was made in 2016. They should have left it alone because the regulations were perfect the way they were before the change was made. The maximum of 1x scope solved several issues and concerns, it help the old eyes that had difficulty with open sights, it did not give the hunter any significant advantage over open sights (some would say it was a disadvantage because it was slightly less power than your natural eye power), limited the affective range of a muzzleloader to keep traditional values, etc. I do not support going back to open sights only and feel that will create more problems for the Division than is needed. Just use the old regulations that were in place before 2016 and be done with this mess that was created in 2016. It is not all that difficult for law enforcement officers to check a 1 x scope in the field as it was accomplished for many years when the prior regulations were in place. Scope manufacturers mark scopes with that type of information. Also people generally try to adhere too and follow the laws that are in place. By going back the the pre 2016 regulations regarding muzzleloaders the Division will avoid all the time spent on approving COR requests, time spent creating new regulations (just copy and paste the old regulations into the new regulations and save all the administrative time) and avoid the complaints from muzzleloader gun owners that have guns that are not taped for open sights. There will be significant push back on this proposal but restrictions need to happen but please make it easy on yourselves and just reinstate the per 2016 muzzleloader rules. Thank you for your time.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 7:27 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Excellent job Blair, on explaining the Technology Committees obligations and final proposal.

As a Committee member myself, it has been an honor being a part of this great team and I look forward to positive changes, whatever the final decisions are.

Technology Committee Member  
Douglas Peterson

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 7:59 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** If having a scope on a muzzleloader only increased success by 3%, leave it alone. A scope gives you a much more precise aiming point thus reducing lost/wounded animals.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 8:25 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** If we are going to give up scopes in muzzleloaders then it's time to get the rifle elk hunt out of the rut and put muzzleloader before rifle on LE elk units.  
It only seems fair

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I wish this was being implemented state wide. Verify is a good this and every unit does not need to be the same. I hope this study helps.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 9:30 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I don't have all the answers, but from what I've seen over the last few years, I'm of the opinion that we need to immediately reduce the amount of permits and offset the 'loss of managemebt funds' by increasing tag prices. Population is lowest I've ever seen. I think it'd be helpful to reduce the amount of livestock competing for resources. Number one priority should be the health and populations of our herds.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 9:40 pm

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 10:01 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Please remove scopes from muzzle loaders. I used to love the muzzle loader hunt before scopes were allowed. It basically turned the hunt into an early rifle hunt with people shooting 400+ yards. That is not what the muzzle loader hunt is supposed to be.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** You have lost the trust of hunters, shop we do not want to participate in anything you propose

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** You don't care what we say, you'll do what you want anyway.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I think the DWR has become too bloated. You no longer care about hunters just money. You have lost our trust, you keep implementing crap laws that really do nothing but make people feel good. I can't support anything you propose here.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 10:51 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I think it's hard to take away scopes once we've already been given the usage of them. I also think that we need better season dates if we are going away from muzzleloading technology. I also think it's hard for people getting into the sport to fall in love with the black powder hunts without the technology. also, if you're limiting the muzzle load technology, I think the high-powered rifle technology also needs to be looked at.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 5:49 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed rule changes to**  
**the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments** I really love the idea of the electronic reporting rather than returning the  
**about the proposed rule changes to the** paper permit.  
**Dedicated Hunter Program?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** All this does is take opportunities away from hunters, literally every hunter I've discussed this with, disagrees with these changes.  
  
The only result you'll get, is a reduction in the number of old/new hunters in the state.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Don't.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 9:49 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

utah needs to manage its deer better. shorten the seasons is great, less tags is great, and four point or better is fantastic. these changes need to be across the whole state not just a few in southern utah. also eliminate optics on muzzle loaders it an unacceptable tool for those weapons. do this. OR shut deer hunting down for three to five years.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Your going to cuss me but I want to know the reason you never make changes to the Tintic herd unit? I was born and raised in Eureka, and have hunted there for all my life. It is killing me to see the decline in Deer in this unit. We have called, and talked in person to DWR officers and complained about the problems there, but are generally treated like we don't know anything about it. I'm around this area two to three days a week and I'm shocked at the decline. I called once about a yearling doe I spotted in Mammoth with severe weight loss and staggering. The office told me someone would get back with me that day. A week later someone called me and wanted to know where the Deer was at, What?? Also we talk to you about the one horned bucks and the increasing number of no horned bucks, and we are totally treated like idiots. It seems the Tintic herd unit has never been cared about, and is still showing that nobody cares. You honestly need to close this unit for awhile and let it be given a break from hunting. I would be the first to say I would'nt put in for another unit until it was opened again. Please give the Tintic herd unit some care and consideration. Thank you

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

---

After watching the video here a few things that bothered me

1. your survey size of 2500 people and a response size of 650 people is a very small percentage of the hunting public. But what the hunting public did respond with is that they wanted to keep scopes. The question needed to be asked, what range do rifle hunters feel comfortable at shooting. I believe that you would see similar results.
2. Changing the rules just to match what other states are doing is following, just to follow.
3. All the data shows an increase of harvest of 2.6% since the regulations changed that allowed scopes of all powers. by removing scopes completely the harvest rate will go down and the rate of woundings/not recovered animals will go up and then people will shoot another animal, and that will result in less animals overall. REMOVING SCOPES WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE OVERALL NUMBERS.
4. If this proposal is approved then you will see a lot of muzzleloader hunters change back over to the any legal weapon hunts and this will make point creep worse.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Love this. Hope people are honest in their feedback. Would even love to know what size of deer was harvested...example a 2x2 or 3x4 or 4x4.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Please explain why we don't make every general season rifle buck into an early and late season? Split the rifle tags so the same amount of tags are being allocated but the number of people out on the mountain is reduced. This should be done state wide.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Muzzleloaders should be able to have a scope. The power should not be more than a 3x9 scope.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Love it.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Way too much private hunting allowed. Not the correct way to go about it. Public already gets screwed over in so many ways.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** Better.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Every CWMU unit needs to offer at least 2 public tags. People with max/high points deserve a better chance to draw. CWMU's already make way too much selling tags. There should be less privately sold tags and more public. Maybe 33% public and 66% private. They need to treat the public fairly. Operator surveys should be concluded by public hunter to report on how CWMU operator was. Also most CWMU are blind shots in the dark. A list of previous public hunters to contact should be available. The operators are not helpful at all.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I agree and applaud the DWR for admitting that something needs to be changed, that the status quo is no longer acceptable. So bravo on that front! As I've hunted across multiple units with multiple weapons, I've only ever experienced a decrease in deer numbers and buck quality/numbers. As an example, this season on the Wasatch West, I spent 4 days hunting and logged over 30 miles hiking, plus many many hours glassing during all times of the day during the hunt, plus multiple scouting trips. I saw tons of twin/triplet fawn sets, plenty of does, and one singular 2 point buck THE ENTIRE YEAR. That's it. So I'm in FIRM support that something needs to be done!

The reason I indicated that I only "somewhat agree" and don't "strongly agree" with this study is simply because I only am on board for 2 of the 3 proposed solutions as they're currently written: the Antler point restrictions (frankly, let's roll that out as a 3 or 4 point or better statewide!), shortened seasons (Colorado does something similar). But I'm not stoked on the restricted weapons hunts as they're currently written. I would feel better if those hunts were offered along with them being available during a better timeframe. As an example, perhaps rather than just offering the restricted rifle hunt during the normal timeframe, maybe it's offered mid-November as a rut hunt? Less ideal weaponry + more ideal timeframe = a good compromise for those people willing to give up some ballistic capability. Higher risk = higher capability for reward.

Additionally, I do wonder if the division has considered what would occur long term for the hunts with antler restrictions? We did witness some improvements on the book cliffs when the point restriction was implemented there, but they were lifted and the struggles began again. What would the "long play" be if the point restrictions worked and buck quality increased and the deer population improved? How would the long term solution evolve in 5 years time?

That said, overall, let's make some changes. I'm willing to see where the the research takes us, and want to see mule deer populations increase.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have zero issue with reverting to the status of a more "primitive" muzzleloader hunt. I have no problem with needing to install a peep sight for the back of my muzzleloader and reverting back to hunting without a scope. Frankly, the comb height on my muzzy makes it less comfortable to shoot the gun with a scope anyways, so I have no problem with this direction. I won't necessarily be out rallying in overwhelming support and picketing in front of DWR headquarters to try to ensure it gets passed, but if this change occurred, I would simply revert to how I hunted prior to the original rule change.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think utah state wide needs to change to 4 point or better atleast on one side but let youth from 12 to age 16 and people with qualified disabilities like me shoot any buck on all the units not being researched while the research is being done on the units specified it would allow more research to see if it helps only allowing youth and people with a disability to shoot younger bucks helps the population thanks for reading please make all these changes and do what people are recommending in comments

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

It hasn't been very many years since this was changed. I have gone and purchased scopes for all of my and my children's muzzleloaders after I had already put a 1X scope on them. We have 3-9 power, those are reasonable, we don't shoot more than 250Yards and now I feel like this is an ex post facto law and we are being forced to get rid of the technology that we were just a few years ago allowed to have. There are other ways to implement this. Have another hunt like the HAMS hunt that doesn't allow the inline. Have part of the extended archery be that hunt. Instead of having all the archery hunters get to have all that extra time allow the muzzleloaders that are primitive to partake.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 12:27 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think instead of reducing tags and putting implementations some units such as wasatch west and central mountains nebo should be closed down from hunting deer all together for about 2 or 3 years

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I have not hunted because I have been with friends and saw how many small antlered bucks were killed and frankly it made me not a hunter. If hunters were really conservationists would they not try and leave the smaller bucks alone and attempt to harvest a more mature buck and let the small ones live? If this rule would go into effect I would be interested in hunting again. I think with how many units Utah has more than 5 units to attempt this. In speaking with friends and co-workers who hunt I believe a 3 point or better should be put out statewide. I do a lot of off-roading and hardly see deer, and when I do I rarely if ever see a nice buck deer. Change it to 3 point or better in majority of the state and I'll start purchasing hunting tags.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

As a non-hunter now does it not seem as though a scope makes the harvesting of an animal more human? I have heard co-workers say that scopes on muzzleloaders makes the hunt funner and they are able to make a more ethical shot and not wound an animal. I say leave the weapons alone and maybe do a hunting season for traditional hunting methods later in the year.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I'm a big fan of mandatory harvest reporting for all hunts. It takes 2 minutes and provides the DWR with a better snapshot of what is actually happening on the ground. The phone surveys are almost obsolete since nobody answers phone calls from unknown callers.

I would recommend that all reporting is due by December 31st of the year rather than 30 days after the hunt ends. If I have 3 tags, I would rather go in and do them all at once.

I'd go for \$25 for residents and \$50 for non-residents.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

I am very supportive of augmenting the populations on Antelope Island as long as there are two public buck antelope tags available in the draw in the future (I'm not a fan of them being sold at the Expo).

Where are you getting the antelope from for the augmentations? I'd love to see some better genetics brought in from our neighbors to the south.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I am not supportive of antler point restrictions for youth hunters.

Setting permits on the 4-year average will be okay in southern Utah (would be completely inappropriate right now in northern Utah). 20% adjustment is a big adjustment.

The future of deer management in Utah appears to look a whole lot like "less tech" and shorter seasons. I don't like that.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Why is the committee so focused on attacking archery and muzzleloaders that have very low success rates compared to rifles? Yes, they are becoming slightly more effective, but not nearly to the extent that rifles have increased their range. If you look at the table where rifles are held constant, you can see when adjustable turret scopes hit the market and became very popular around 2020.

I do have a muzzleloader, and I primarily only hunt archery and muzzleloader seasons. My rifles barely get touched. I am EXTREMELY OPPOSED to taking scopes off muzzleloaders for youth hunters. For adults, it usually doesn't make a big difference, but for KIDS, it is a HUGE difference. They just don't have the skills yet to shoot open sights beyond 50 yards or so. Kids can't shoot 200 yards with open sights with any level of consistency and this will result in injured wildlife that is not recoverable. Anyone who says otherwise has never hunted with a kid during muzzleloader season.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I think dedicated hunters absorb too many general season permits by percentage now that permit allocations have been cut so much over the past few years. I am very opposed to the new per-hour fee for hours. I enjoyed volunteering, but I am very hesitant to rejoin in the future.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do not recommend that the division remove scopes in muzzleloaders. Due to the fact that 3% of kill rate is not that high. Muzzleloaders are already limited in what they can do and I do not think after 5-6 years it would be fair to remove scopes from them. If the division is worried or concerned about the success rate of animals killed during the muzzle loader hunter the. I believe they need to take  
A good hard look at the sept rifle elk hunt that run peak rut for limited entry tag holders. If the division wants to go off of the fact that Arizona and Utah are the only states that allow muzzleloaders with scopes. Utah is the only state that allows hunters to hunt bulls during the rut. I strongly disagree with the technogly rule and the division going back on something that has not really  
Impacted muzzleloader success. I would  
Like to talk more in depth of this with someone via email or phone thank you.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

The "taking big game" rule I believe will help out in getting accurate numbers for the deer & elk populations. Making hunters complete the harvest survey before they can receive another tag is really going to get people involved. However, I wouldn't waive the late fee if a hunter doesn't complete the survey the first year. I believe this will pro-long the data needed to accurately forecast the amount of deer & elk tags that need to be given out for each unit across Utah.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I do believe we need to let populations come back for both elk & deer. The area's I hunt I have seen a drastic decline in both species. I do understand the winter of 2022-2023 did take its toll on the populations. This 2023 hunting season in my opinion should have been cancelled. I also do understand people count on getting these tags to fill their freezers, with the hunting being cancelled you would have had more poaching and more fines. We have to look out for not only the animals but for future generation hunters as well. I have a son and I am concerned he won't get to experience a hunt where he can't pick and choose a buck he wants. Populations have to come back, either less tags each year for a few years, or shut down hunting every other year for a certain period of time.

We are in a world where technology is evolving everyday, rifles are shooting farther, muzzleloaders are becoming more accurate at farther distances. I firmly believe that if you start taking away the technology this is going to result in more wounded and unable to locate animals that have either been struck by an arrow or a bullet.

Antler point rule. This is a must, bucks that are less than 3 points need to have a chance to mature. The 2 points/spike deer get hit hard every year in the area I hunt from "road hunters." People see antlers and it is time to harvest no matter how old, how mature the buck deer is. If you shoot all the young deer year after year you will never see healthy mature populations anywhere.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Muzzleloaders definitely need to have their own seasons for both deer & elk and they need to keep having scopes put on them. I believe people will stop muzzle load hunting if only peep/iron sights are allowed. Keep the muzzleloaders "as is" but lower the amount of tags if the success rate is higher. More people will start hunting with an any legal weapon and keep their high power scopes on those and then they will continue to shoot farther and farther.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I agree with all of these. I would suggest that there be a timeline to participate in a harvest survey for the dedicated hunter. If the hunter doesn't participate it is counted as a harvest or a late fee is required to complete that survey so they obtain a tag for the following year.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I'm okay with the idea to try out some new management plans and see how it affects the buck populations in certain units, but I think some of the rules are not backed by science. How have scoped in-line muzzleloaders impacted the the harvest or wounding of bucks compared to more traditional, scopeless muzzleloaders? Same question with compound bows vs traditional type bows... Are more animals wounded with traditional type weapons than newer technology driven weapons? Would you rather have more bucks harvested legally or more bucks wounded and not recovered?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** How have scoped in-line muzzleloaders impacted the wounding of bucks compared to more traditional, scopeless muzzleloaders? Same question with compound bows vs traditional type bows... Are more animals wounded with traditional type weapons than newer technology driven weapons? Would you rather have more bucks harvested legally or more bucks wounded and not recovered? I don't think more harvests is a bad thing, especially when you compare to more wounded bucks. In-line, scoped muzzy hunts ARE still unique hunts. I'm against changing any rules with this hunt/weapon.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I agree with all of these changes

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Please, for the future of mule deer let's try this!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I support harvest reporting. Make sure hunters get multiple emails and maybe even a letter mailed to them asking for the report before taking adverse action.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Go for it! Might as well try this and see what it does. It's only for a few years and the southern RAC has been asking for stuff like this anyways so I say go for it!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** YES! The Muzzleloader hunt should be different than the ALW hunt and taking the scopes off does this. The muzzleloader hunt was turning into a single shot rifle hunt and not too different than the ALW hunt, this brings it back to it's roots. Honestly we should have restrictions like Idaho. Muzzleloader tech is crazy and every year it gets better. Smokeless powder muzzleloaders that shoot the same velocities as regular rifles are becoming very accessible and they would be near impossible to police so something has to happen.

You are going to get a lot of pushback from people because they bought fancy scopes and muzzleloaders since scopes were allowed in 2016, remember that no one complained to the RAC or WB that they were forced to buy this equipment so they can't complain now that it's coming off! People can't have it both ways--I am going to have to sell the scope off my muzzleloader but that is ok because we need to have this be a different hunt and not darn near the same as the ALW hunt.

Please support the DWR in their technology recommendations. Thank you

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Sounds good thanks

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 5:15 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments** Expanding this research study in to other units as well .  
**about the research study or the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I think we should change the antler restriction to 3 point or better not including the eye guard for all units but I would like youth new hunters and senior citizens to be exempt from antler restrictions. I like the longer season it doesn't put as many people on the mountain the same time as me. Especially for archery that already has low success rates don't hurt them. With restricted weapons don't take away compound bows. The archery success rates will never pass muzzleloaders or any legal weapon success rates. I've hunted deer for 15 plus years with a bow have had a tag almost every year and with my compound bow I've only shot 2 deer. Don't ban compounds. With any legal weapon don't ban scopes I want to hunt the way I want to hunt. Ban 10 power and up scopes let us still have scopes on our guns like a 3-9 power scope. I want to hunt the way I want to but I understand restricting scopes just don't outright ban them. Most guns don't come with iron sights let me hunt with guns that I have scopes on. Really consider my input please.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Allow low power scopes on muzzleloaders. Keep in-line muzzleloaders ban high powered scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 6:25 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** This will provide more opportunity for hunters and keep muzzleloaders as a more primitive weapon. I support this as I would like to be proactive so we can keep .209 primers and pelleted powder

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** For myself I would not care about the restrictions, but my daughter has dedicated on dutton and at 12 years old she is not at a skill level to take on these restrictions and I know partial refunds and points are going to be offered, but in her case she already completed all of her 32 service hours. Including 8 hours that I paid for. A more palatable solution would be to let us swap to another unit without restrictions and allow her to finish her 2 remaining years with all her completed hours intact. If not, that is labor hours she will have to replicate again on a new unit and that is not right.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The presentation of this was biased toward a change sway from muzzy scopes. The data showed a negligible increase in success with muzzleloaders and there is no way to differentiate how much of that came from those using scopes vs red dots, 1x scopes, open sight, etc. There was obviously an agenda from the beginning of the committee to do away witg the scope and when there was not overwhelming data to support the need, the presented couched the responses of the poles to try and justify the change based on social input from respondent. Half wanted no change and then a lesser percentage of undecided and those that were for it turned into a quote of "half want no change and two thirds are okay with it." I know it was said the division wants to base thing on science, but they are wiffing on basic math/fractions in support of the push to disallow scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

For myself I would not care about the restrictions, but my daughter has dedicated on dutton and at 12 years old she is not at a skill level to take on these weapon restrictions and I know partial refunds and points are going to be offered, but in her case she already completed all of her 32 service hours. Including 8 hours that I paid for. A more palatable solution would be to let us swap to another unit without restrictions and allow her to finish her 2 remaining years with all her completed hours intact. If not, that is a significant loss of labor hours that she will have to replicate again on a new unit and that is not right having ti draw again and have wasted all of those hours.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

The data and information shared in regards to the need for this change just simply doesn't provide enough evidence for implementation. All weapons have evolved over the years. I won't list all the advancements that have been accepted and those that haven't but powered optics were accepted in 2016 and to date there hasn't been anything to show that this change has made a negative impact as far as I can find in any data, literature or communications from the DNR. Hunter satisfaction and very possibly wounded/not recovered ratios have most likely improved. This is data currently only collections on limited entry hunts but would most likely be representative of general season of surveys were taken. My strongest opinion for keeping the current regulations primarily have to do with limited entry muzzleloader hunts. Most rifle, muzzleloader and some archery on top quality units have essentially become once in a lifetime hunts due to the points needed to draw a tag. Of tag numbers are in line with the harvest objectives where is the negative in allowing hunters the option of ethically responsible technology? I agree there are technologies that cross this line but powered optics on muzzleloaders haven't proven to be the case.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 9:16 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments**      If Archery has the lowest harvest success why are we taking away  
**about the research study or the**      compound bows? They are the most common bow in use today!  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Why not try something on the manti. The unit has huge potential but it gets hammered on deer, and elk hunting. Why do southern Utah units get all the attention? Make tooth submission mandatory. I have watched the quality of bulls killed of the manti this year and it's sad to see how far down hill the quality of bulls has gone. I don't believe your age data. Too many people don't submit teeth when they shoot a young bull after waiting 15 years to hunt and have jumped from other units they can't draw. What about all the no harvest, shouldn't it count as something in the age calculation?

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

At least something is being done to do something different.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Get rid of scopes on muzzleloader and limit magnification on rifles. It will make a difference. The advanced muzzleloaders with scope make the muzzleloader hunt just another rifle hunt.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

As a dedicated hunter on the Boulder unit this completely screws me over. I understand the changes and I agree with it to an extent. But it is absurd that we wouldn't be able to use compound bows, or in line muzzleloaders. Shorten the seasons, do the four point or better on one side and take away scopes on muzzleloaders that I can accept. But don't make us go out and spend thousands getting new hunting equipment (guns, ammo, bow, etc). My personal opinion, using recurve bows will only wound more animals, the same goes for not using scopes on rifles. Why isn't thousand lake mountain part of the research? The deer numbers in that unit are horrible. My family owns property on the thousand lake unit and we usually have deer in our hay fields but not this year, no deer are to be found. Let that unit be the trial unit and not the Boulder.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 11:11 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

If I had known these changes were going to happen on the unit I'm currently a dedicated hunter on I would have changed units. But half reimbursement for screwing us over isn't gonna cut it. It should be a full refund, we aren't making the changes as hunters, it's on you why should we have to pay the price?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This will be good

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think this will be good you could add a management hunt in the future For the youth but you need to no the Rule does not state no inline muzzleloader it just says cap must be Visible

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I have muzzleloader hunted for over 30 year and this need to happen

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 6:50 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Utah needs to go back to open sights on muzzleloaders. The newer in lines are absolutely ridiculous on the long range capabilities(I have one). Let's all be on a level playing field.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 7:20 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Are you here to help the wild life or make money? Scope restrictions will result in more unethical shots. You need to cut tags the hills are already over crowded with people. On every hunt 10 guys per 1000 yards

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 7:36 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I disagree with the removing of scopes on muzzleloaders. If they find that it only effects hunting at 3% then why are we doing this? It would be better to go back to what it was before with a 1 to 4 power scope, not just completely eliminate scopes from muzzleloaders. I am a hunter and always up for a more challenging hunt but I disagree with this proposal.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Raise the price of general deer and cut the tags. I have hunted the Wasatch west unit for the last 13 years and it has drastically gone down hill haven't seen a mature buck in 4 years. You give way to many tags for this unit I'm tired of it just being the cash cow, let's think about the deer for once. I'm not your average road hunter I hike up maple Provo, cascade, timp. There's just not many deer but I'm sure you'll give another 7 or 8 thousand tags and hope a couple two points made it threw. I been trying to support you guys and listen but it's just gotten too bad!

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I agree with collecting data to help inform decisions related to tag numbers in areas. I also would hope that the information gained from requiring harvest reporting will be made public information.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I agree with doing what we need to in order to help a population's health. I also hope that plans are being made to ensure that pronghorn habit is healthy as well.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I strongly disagree with putting any points restrictions on any hunting areas that are general season. The only thing I see this leading to is an increase in non-mature bucks breeding does, we do not need to have a decrease in genetic diversity in our deer population. I have hunted in Wyoming where some places have a points restriction the game wardens there do not think that point restrictions have a positive effect on the deer herd. I believe that this would only increase infractions in the area and punish those that are not trophy hunters. We eat the animals we shoot and do not mind taking a two point buck in a general deer hunt to put a little meat in our freezer.

I also do not understand why we want to create hunts for primitive weapons, I only see these types of hunts as increasing wounded animals. It only seems like all the restrictions on hunting equipment is meant to decrease the success rates on a hunt area so more tags can be sold. If its money we need let's increase the fee to apply for hunts and tags fees to get more money available for projects that need to be done to increase deer herd size and health. This can also be looked at as a help to every citizen in the state as ways for deer to cross roadways would decrease motor deer related incidents.

I agree with the last two strategies that are mentioned; habit improvement work, watershed restoration and increased summer range. Continuing aggressive predator-management programs. If these things are done there will be an increase in the deer populations, deer health in the area, which will be unrelated to what hunting strategies are put in place in the region. It was mentioned that scientific based studies need to be done, there are too many variables applied in these areas to effectively see if the hunting strategy, tag numbers, habitat improvements or predator management programs are improving deer populations.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do not believe that removing scopes from muzzleloaders or moving towards none inline muzzleloaders would help increase deer populations. I believe that more animals are going to be wounded and lost, similar to archery hunts. I believe efforts should be directed at educating hunters in understanding rules, regulations and firearm / bow ranges and capabilities through a test the hunter would have to pass before they receive their tag.

If we want to increase deer herds size and health in the state of Utah, we need to find ways to increase survival rates for fawns and does through the winter such as Continuing to improve wintering ground, providing safe ways for deer to cross roads and decreasing predator populations in the areas that need the most help.

If the purpose of this is the limit the effective range of muzzleloaders, a better option would be to limit powder charges (150 grains of compressed powder or equivalent), move to at least a 45 caliber rifle and limit scope magnification (7-9 X max). While also educating hunters through a test. Scopes allow me make a more accurate, and more predictable shot on an animal. I have not used scopes on my muzzleloader to increase the range I shot. If the purpose of these restrictions are to increase revenue, increase the fee to apply for tags and tag fees. If this is a way to get more hunters afield but decrease success, I do not think this does it in the right way.

I also do not understand why muzzleloaders are a priority in the technology recommendations. Technology such as blue tooth connecting range finders and scopes that can be used on rifles or muzzleloaders, these technologies that make people think the range they can shoot an animals is much more than it actually is. I am really concerned with the possibilities of wounded lost animals increasing in our state. I also think that it's time to introduce a test that helps hunters understand ethical ranges, rules and regulations for every tag a hunter can get in the state. The rules and regulations are getting extremely complicated and I have seen an increase in hunters not following or being aware of regulations in the field.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Land owners not participating in a CWMU program should not be allowed to participate in any type of draw program that allows them access to tags, especially if this takes away from public hunters, such as reducing tag numbers in an area and putting those into a special draw for landowners. Landowners should not have access to any separate tags for limited entry, they should have to draw a tag just like anyone else in the state.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is great, thank you! When we have better data, we can make more informed decisions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** This is a great thing as well, thank you!

One suggestion when it comes to the arid land that pronghorn call home, can we please increase funding and better collaborate with other stakeholders to maintain, improve, and create water sources (guzzlers, lining ponds, etc.). I've spent considerable time in the units in central and southern Utah listed. There are quite a few guzzlers and ponds that used to hold water but don't now due to disrepair.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

These are very innovative proposals that I generally am excited to see. I have two items I'm not sure about right now.

The restricted weapon hunt is the one that I'm not sure about. Why not keep archery and muzzleloaders the same, especially if scopes aren't allowed. Then restrict rifles to open sights or a low power scope? If you look at the harvest on the Dutton and Boulder, rifle hunters kill the most deer by far compared to archery and muzzleloader. Another thought.. what if we adjusted some unit boundaries (similar to what we've done for LE elk) and make some deer units smaller: Kaiporawitz, SW Desert North, etc. Then make some changes to weapons.

I'm not against antler point restrictions but am a little concerned with it being 4 point or better. Why not 3 point or better? As you know, there are old, mature 2 and 3 points each year. If we don't take these bucks, they continue to spread those genes. If the 4 point or better is approved, could we implement/consider a management hunt later in the year to harvest these bucks similar to the Henries and Pauns? Maybe during the rut when they are most visible.

As I mentioned, I am pretty excited by most of these recommendations. We can not forget the following and their impact on our deer: predators, road kill, habitat (specifically related to loss of wintering grounds) and water improvements.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I'm supportive of removing scopes on muzzleloaders even though I have thoroughly enjoyed it.

I would like to see rifle hunters have some restrictions placed on their weapons. We have placed restrictions on archery hunters (no Garmin site) and now muzzy hunters (no scopes). If those hunters are asked to give up something, rifle hunters should as well. If we are placing these restrictions to give more opportunity and help our deer, we need to look at which hunt kills the most deer and get innovative during that weapon type hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I'm supportive of these changes to the dedicated hunter program.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

I am supportive of the first two recommendations and don't have any concerns with either. If I am understanding this correctly, land owners would only be able to hunt private land. Is that correct? Depending on that information, my rating would likely change.

I do have some reservation with the third recommendations. I don't agree with over the counter general season deer permits on general units. This is essentially a lifetime deer license and some of these general tags take many years for a general member of the public to draw. Is there a tag limit per landowner? Would someone purchase the tag directly from the landowner or from a vendor? If the tag is sold, can the landowner hunt an additional deer with a different tag? Can the person that purchased the tag hunt an additional deer with a different tag? Is the tag only valid for private lands (similar to antlerless elk tags)?

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

I'm generally supportive of these recommendations.

Maybe this can be clarified in the RAC tour or Board meeting, what is the difference between item 6 and item 7?

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Overall, I'm supportive of these recommendations.

I'm not familiar with the Double Cone CWMU. I am just curious as to why 45% of the CWMU is public land. This is by far the highest percentage of any CWMU. Is it land locked public? Was there a land swap? It also doesn't appear to favor more public hunters in regards to tags, tag percentages are the same as other CWMUs.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 12:49 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am strongly in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I have powder hunted for over 20 years and would like to see it back the way it was before people were shooting animals at 500 yards with a muzzleloader. If hunters insist on using a scoped gun, there is an any legal weapon hunt they can use it on. Thanks

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I think this is a good idea to help know the success rates of hunts, and deer. If possible I would like to receive an email with a link to the reporting survey. I agree with the fee but I think \$50 is really expensive. I think having it would be beneficial for hunters to reduce that fee or maybe it could be a \$20 dollar fee for the first missed reporting, then next year it would increase to \$30, and so on. Or it could also be a lower amount based on how late the report was submitted (\$10 for 1-7 days late, \$20 for 7-14 days late, \$30 for 15-21 days late, etc.)

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

Somewhat agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I disagree with the restricted archery equipment, I think it is silly to penalize the hunters with the lowest success rates. I feel like many of the younger bucks will not have the fat reserves to survive the harsh winters. I don't agree with the 4 point or better stipulation, especially since there are mature bucks who are only 2 or 3 point bucks. I have seen plenty of 2 points and 3 points with bigger bodies than the 4 point in the bachelor group.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I agree with limiting scopes on muzzleloaders, I do not believe that a muzzleloader should be able to shoot 300-400 yards, unless it is being used for an any legal weapon hunt. I think a limited scope power is a good middle ground to ensure good shots and reduce the number of animals that are wounded. I think as people are able to use higher powered scopes on muzzleloaders they are more likely to take shots that are unethical and outside their effective range. I agree with the proposed changes for the arrow length, as long as those do not impact the energy associated with the shot. I am concerned that could lead to more wounded animals and more issues with recovery of game animals.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I have not participated in the dedicated hunter program yet, but have plans to do so. I think all of these changes make sense and would improve hunter participation in the program.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 3:47 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I strongly disagree about putting muzzleloaders to open sights only. The increase in successful hunts is negligible with scopes and removing them you are increasing the chances for wounded animals. If anything limit it to a 9x or less. Removing scopes is a terrible idea

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This makes perfect sense. No reason for hunters not to report harvest.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I appreciate that Utah is making real efforts to deliver on the two most requested items: Increased opportunity and increased hunting quality. The methods presented are practical to achieve these goals. Sure, I would love to hunt deer and elk every single year with a rifle and have super long season dates but that is not practical. On the other hand, something like traditional archery is an extremely practical way to allow hunters to have robust hunting opportunity every year. I would love to see traditional archery implemented in a general and broad way. A game management strategy that incentivizes more hunters to opt for traditional archery over longer range weapons would significantly increase opportunity while simultaneously improving hunting quality across the board. This would also be a powerful way to protect deeply rooted hunting heritage, culture, skills and knowledge from being replaced with technology.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Yes! If we want to keep a muzzleloader seasons then we need to use actual muzzleloaders. The effective range of hunting weapons was one of the primary considerations when Archery, Muzzleloader and Rifle seasons were originally created. The effective ranges of modern Archery, Muzzleloader and Rifle equipment have advanced exponentially since these seasons were originally created. Regarding modern technology the question is frequently asked "where do we draw the line?". I think that we should regulate our weapons to keep their effective ranges similar to when these seasons were originally created. It would make sense moving forward to have weapon effective range articulated in the actual weapon definition as this would provide direction and transparency that would facilitate regulation changes so that game management agencies can keep pace with quickly evolving weapon technologies.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory harvest reporting is a really good tool.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I strongly agree that these are some the steps that need to be taken in trying to help our struggling deer herds. I feel that this should take place on all units, statewide, rather than a select few for a trial run. If it works with the trial units then the other units will be 4 years behind. 2 Week archery hunt, 5-day hunts on all of the other muzzleloader and rifle hunts are all great moves. Antler Point Restrictions will also help with over harvest of yearling bucks. Make deer hunting great again across the whole state.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I don't see a big reason to take scopes off muzzleloaders. Harvest has increased across the board on all hunts no matter the weapon types. One disadvantage that could be huge is if scopes are removed from muzzleloaders, it could potentially affect draw odds on the rifle hunt by having more people move from muzzleloader to rifle. This could potentially cause a bigger bottle neck in drawing a rifle tag. On the questions to of keeping it status quo, there really wasn't a desire of change one way or the other. KEEP SCOPES ON MUZZLELOADERS! Keep people spread out or distributed for permits. Or at least it would give some one more of an incentive to apply for a muzzleloader permit if they can see to shoot. The HAMS hunts already exist and are available to people that want to go old school.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Make the necessary changes for the dedicated hunter program to comply with the rest of the general deer system.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

This is the part that I strongly agree with. Create a general-season landowner permit that is only valid on private property. If landowners are given permits, then they should only be valid on their private property. Their private property is the reason they are allowed the permit. Landowners shouldn't be able to hunt the whole unit with a permit issued because of their property. If the animals are on their ground, let them secure a permit to take the animal on their ground. It doesn't make sense for landowners to be able to take an animal with a private landowner permit outside of their land boundary that doesn't have any effect on their property.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Thank you for being so proactive and willing to try new ideas. These should also be tested in units further North.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I witnessed a deer get shot at 650 yards this year in the muzzleloader hunt. This is much needed!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Why are CWMUs allowed a 90:10 ratio for buck deer and bull elk? I understand if they do this, then the public gets 100% of the antlerless tags, but let's be real. Is a 90:10 split really fair? I understand that the landowner is opening his private land to hunters, BUT he is receiving benefit from a PUBLIC resource to do so. I would favor reducing the ratio to 70:30 or 75:25 as a way to make this equitable to public hunters. The landowner still gets the majority of the tags (as he should) and public hunters are not getting the scraps from what is a public resource (the animals).

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 8:16 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I fully support no scopes on muzzleloaders, even reeling it back to no inline muzzleloaders. Maybe adopt all of Idaho's muzzleloader rules, they are quite pure.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

How are a significant number of additional permits going to be issued if the having scopes on muzzleloaders is only increasing success by 2.6%? That statement seems patently false and misleading and has nothing to do with what the actual data is telling us...which is that scopes on muzzleloaders do not significantly increase harvest success.

The muzzleloader hunt can be a more primitive hunt and still allow variable power scopes. Muzzleloaders only have one shot - very different from rifles. They must be loaded from the bore - much different than rifles. They have to use a separate ignition source - much different than a rifle. If the committee wants to recommend any restrictions with scopes, it should be to do away with ballistic turrets on scopes. This alone will not allow all but the most dedicated shooters to kill animals beyond 300 yards.

So, to recap, if success rates are not markedly better with scopes, then why is this an issue? If any restrictions to scopes are implemented, then outlaw ballistic turrets to keep "long range shooting" to a bare minimum.

And finally, why does it matter what other states are doing with respect to this issue? That should not be a consideration whatsoever. Have you seen the direction CO and NM are headed? They'll be lucky if their access to hunting isn't restricted to some degree in the near future due to demographic changes that lean away from hunting as a right.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I am not in favor of antler restrictions. From the research I have done and the data I have read antler restrictions don't really play much of a factor in the overall size of the herd or the size of bucks.

I believe a better option would be to reduce the overall tag allocations by as much as 30%. Some members of the public are going to be mad and talk about how hunting in Utah just isn't the same as it was when they were kids growing up in the 70s and 80s. Our population in Utah has grown and there simply are not enough resources for the demand. Unfortunately, not everyone is going to be able to hunt every year.

Another option is to break up the deer hunt into 3 or 4 shorter seasons and push them later into the fall similar to Colorado. This would help with crowding and it reduces the amount of people in the field at one time. Also make the season opener dates stick to dates, not days of the week. IE. The deer hunt is always October 21-26 every year. This could result in only 1 weekend, or none at all, to fall during the hunt period.

You could also close down more roads and trails to ATVs and dirt bikes and only allow foot traffic.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly disagree with the proposal to eliminate scopes from muzzleloaders. The data suggests that they only increase hunter success by 3% which is so small that it could likely be related to other factors and not the scopes themselves.

As stated in the presentation most hunters do not feel comfortable taking shots longer than 200 yards with a muzzleloader. My fear is that eliminating scopes will lead to hunters still taking shots within 200 yards that are not as accurate and lead to more wound loss.

I do my best with any weapon to get as close to the animal as possible to ensure a clean and ethical kill. For me, my simple 3-9x40mm scope gives me some confidence that I will hit the animal where I intend and get a quick clean kill.

Most of the new long-range muzzys are bolt action, use magnum rifle primers, and shoot the smaller .45CAL all of which allow for longer shots. In my opinion, a better option would be to only allow muzzleloaders that shoot .50CAL, must use standard 209 primers (or musket cap), and must be limited to 150grains or less of powder.

If the desire is to stop hunters from being able to take long shots limiting the technology that lets the rifle shoot further, not eliminate the thing that gives hunters confidence to make a good shot.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 6:48 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I agree that all hunters should be required to report their data whether a tag was filled or not. And this should of been implemented years ago.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Neither agree nor disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

My first question is why only do the study's with the shortened seasons, weapons restriction and so on in the southern Utah units only? Why not spread them out across the state to see how these changes are going to affect different areas across the whole state versus just the southwest corner of the state. Why not have some units with these restrictions in the northern and central parts of the state?

I mostly agree there needs to be a antler point limit for most of the state, especially for hunters 18 and older. I do not however agree with a 4 point or better on one side for some units there are big mature three point out there. And say you are tracking a deer and a buck jumps you see a big tall wide frame and have a split second to decide to shoot or not. so you shoot and that big tall wide frame is a 30 inch wide 3 point although a mature buck you just broke the law. And talking with hunters from when there was point limits they say it was not that uncommon to find 2 points folks had shot and just left lay because it didn't meet the antler point requirement. And that is the only problem I see with antler point resections and it could turn into a big problem.

I am on the fence about a shortened season dates, I feel a 5 day should be the minimum of days to hunt, and there should be no shortened days on a unit that has a four point on one side minimum and or weapons restrictions.

I do not agree fully with your weapon restrictions, mainly the no scopes on rifles. Most rifles do not come factory or even have options for open/peep sights. So one would half to pay a smith to put them on or by a new rifle them already installed. Either way it is a extra cost to a hunter that more then likely already has one or more scoped rifles. And what about folks with eye sight issues? when I showed my Dad this video his replay was well looks like I'm done hunting. I should note that my family hunts and I grew up hunting the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit area. I could think scopes could be limited say to 44mm objective lens, not open/adjustable long range turrets, no reticle illuminations and even scope powers.

I do not agree putting all the restriction on the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit. Most of the people I know or have meet that hunt that unit are already hunting mature deer only. And will pass on the younger bucks two points and three points.

Also any time a comment is made about weapon technology improvements most of the time muzzleloaders and rifles are the only ones mentioned. And yes it is true a lot of technology advancements in those areas, but in my opinion there is no form of hunting that has had more technology improvements made and left unchecked then archery. All modern archery equipment is made stronger, lighter, faster, quitter then the equipment from as little as 20 years ago. if I go shoot with friends and pull out my 2004 Hoyt they laugh and say something like you need to get a new bow the technology is so much better now. And as far as the long range

muzzleloader thing, that can of worms was created by the division when any power scope was allowed in 2016. And now that a lot of hunters are spending money, a lot of times hard earned saved up money for this long range technology the division allowed to be used. You all want to back peddle on it and say nope no more scopes on muzzleloaders.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Love the mandatory reporting!

A few suggested edits:  
-Give a hunter 90 days post hunt to complete. 30 seems short.  
-Don't make 2024 a trial year. You already know how to do this. Rip the bandaid off!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Seems smart to augment. Please prioritize public over private sites. Sure hope we have enough population to actually augment.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Seems like an interesting study. That said, some of these suggestions fly directly in the face of what the DWR itself has told us for year 'don't work'! Like 5 day hunts and antler restrictions. Are you all just throwing darts blindly at a board???

I'm all for better quality, but seems like you are really guessing!

4 point or better antler point restrictions seems like it could be reduced to 3 point or better.

5 days is tight for a hunt. 7 day minimum would be better.

Seems like "option 2" has failed. So much for growing more deer.

Also, if you do actually grow more quality on 4 years, then take a break and go back, the next year's hunt could be a slaughter when scoped rifles come back. Don't throw away any progress if this actually works.

Lastly, you need to limit the # of lifetime license holders for any of these hunts. Put a % cap on each hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

The changes to muzzy scopes aren't supported by any science (harvest rate increase of 2.5% from random sampling is not significant) OR the majority of hunter feedback. Seems like this group recommended their personal agendas vs what the data and MOST people said. The "spin" the DWR and tech committee took on this was done poorly.

If you need to make changes, don't swing the pendulum so far. Keep some optic (1-4x and/or red dot on top). I had to get glasses for the first time this year...having some optic is a big help for old eyes.

The Wildlife Board member who pushed for this is now gone...sounds like this was due to shadiness on his CWMU. Sad if true.

More things to consider:

- Utah hunters have payed a lot of money for scopes. Could be painful for lots of folks to take those off.
- Don't make your suggestions based on what other states are doing. Dumb.
- I'm actually good with making it tougher to harvest. Just make it really clear what the rule is, easily enforceable and easy to implement for hunters.
- Based on deer #'s I've seen this year, it's highly unlikely we will soon have too many deer on the landscape in a 4 year period. We are nowhere near carrying capacity. Please don't up the buck harvest based on buck to doe ratio changes. We need way more deer...period.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

- glad to see the orientation test go away.
- also glad to see the online report vs sending back in a physical tag.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

This program is already liberal enough. Quit making it easier to get tags for them.

I hate taking any permits out of general season or LE tag #'s strongly opposed!

I hate taking away any public access!

And I think it's a bad idea to be able to resell permits intended for family use only.

Lastly, how can you ensure these tags stay on private lands when the public is land-locked? You know folks would cross this line...

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

Unit wide tags seem overly generous here. And take away from tags the public can draw. Keep these to private lands only. Option 2

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

- don't allow public lands NEAR/INSIDE OF/ADJACENT to private to be included in a CWMU!!
- Shift from 10% of buck/bull tags for public to 30%. Or stop selling the "great public opportunity" pitch. This program is almost entirely for selling big \$ hunts to high paying clients.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I like the harvest reporting idea, but the penalties are fairly strict. I think the forgiveness period and fee shouldn't just be in year 1. Allow people to report and pay the fine even if they forget after their hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I'm very interested in the results of these studies. I love that you're also asking questions beyond just antler size and buck to doe ratio.. I think hunter satisfaction questions that you're planning to ask are great tools. I'll be very interested to see if the shortened season causes more congestion in the field.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I'm not a muzzy hunter but no scopes, not even single power, seems pretty harsh. I'd be interested to know wounding rates for open sites vs. single power scopes. I love that you're planning to reduce the distance of shots by removing scopes, but I just hunch that single power scopes might accomplish the same goal and limit wounded animals.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 7:55 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I would like more units involved in the study. Example: The Boulder unit deer population is below objective size population numbers. Different factors(drought, winter kill. predators) can influence the population The proposed research on several units will give a better average of the effects. Drought, winter kill, and predators will have an impact on one unit and could adversely impact the research. A factor such as winter kill could drastically impact the study research. Thanks!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I agree with the 4 point or better recommendation, but I think restricting the number of days during a hunt will increase younger bucks being killed and harming the population.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I think there should a limit on scope powers for muzzleloaders. I don't think that all scopes should be removed. I think a 3 power restriction would be a good compromise.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Scopes on muzzleloaders should not be removed. 3% increased success is probably just due to more deer or more people hunting. If you remove scopes, then the muzzleload hunt needs to go back to completely primitive. Percussion, ball and patch. I would be fine with that. Now that everybody has spent all this money on scopes and such because they were made legal, it's not right to take them away. Now if people are shooting these muzzleloaders with longer range capability, but with open sights, there is going to be alot more wounded and not retrieved game. So either leave it the way it is, or go back to primitive muzzleloaders only on all muzzleload hunts

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Hello, your recommendation do not reflect accurately what your bar graphs showed. You are taking the data and putting the spin that the division or wildlife board wants to do. The general public according to you graph does not support the restriction of scopes on ML hunts. The data shows no significant difference in satisfaction, wounding or quality. So what is your goal. I think you stated that you believe opportunity for more LOW success hunts. I'm pretty sure that will impact satisfaction. I reiterate, you stated managing for more LOW SUCCESS hunts. Very odd goal in my opinion. Leave muzzleloaders as is. Look at more limitations on centerfire rifles and the technology in optics on those. Also if it hasn't already been done, restrict smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. That will limit your range probably as much as removing scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

1 public tag per 6 landowner tags is not a good deal for the public. Should be closer to 1 to 3 ratio.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 10:27 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I agree with all changes except the weapons restrictions of the compound bows and muzzleloader. Why would I need to buy new equipment when bows and muzzleloader are generally harder hunts as it is. With Longbows and flintlocks people are less experienced and could lead to more errant shots and wounded animals. As with rifle, taking away scopes will only add more errors. I believe if it's just point restrictions and shorter season dates that majority of hunters will still hunt those units but will Not with the weapons restrictions

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I like the shorter hunting days  
I like the weapon restrictions.  
I don't like that 1 unit will be the sacrificial lamb.  
I believe there needs to be more units across the state to implement these changes, not just the Boulder unit.  
Please choose 4-8 more units to restrict throughout the state.  
That will give better data than just 1 unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

The division should be making it harder for people to participate in the Dedicated Hunter Program.  
People that complain about the program requirements are too [REDACTED] lazy.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

The option to compensate non-LOA limited entry landowners has been a long time in the making. This proposal will benefit Utah's wildlife on those units with large blocks of private lands with many different owners, especially the Nebo and Wasatch. I support the rest of the landowner rule changes as well, good job to those that made this happen.

Something similar to these proposals was expected by many to come out of the committee the last time around but didn't for some reason...better late than never. May not be a perfect fit for all but it's a big step in the right direction.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I question how honest some hunters will be in self reporting harvest, without sending in your tag.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I guess I missed the part when I first reported my feedback that the season for archery was shortened to 2 weeks, I am definitely not in favor of that at all, also the fact that I cannot use a compound bow really makes me upset, archery is already expensive to get into and I would have to buy a different bow, get used to shooting it as well as have to get new arrows, I can't just take my scope off my rifle and call it good, this change will be detrimental to archery hunting, like I said in my first comment on the subject where we get a new traditional archery season and give like 15% of the total archery tags to that season then I am totally in favor of that, but to make me either spend way more money just to hunt in the first place or try to take years to get another rifle tag that would make me very upset and I'm sure others as well

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Please make wasatch west a 3 point or better unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** If the success rate is only 3% increase then why change it? Leave scopes on muzzleloaders! I myself put a scope on mine which was \$400. That money will basically go to waste and so will a lot of other peoples money.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Scoped muzzleloaders aren't the problem. The muzzleloaders get 1/3 of the limited entry tags vs. the rifle hunts. The harvest rates have only increased 2.5%. If your proposing taking scopes off muzzleloaders it's only fair to regulate the rifle hunters as well. There are schools teaching everyone how to become a long range hunters and the rifle hunters are way more guilty than the muzzleloader hunters at taking long shots. Not to mention having a scope and being able to see is more effective at harvesting and keeping wound rates down. Biggest problem now days is the guides in the field. No one can compete with them. They take all the big animals off the units and they are ruining hunting for everyone

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 6:31 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I have been a muzzleloader hunter for over 35 years,When scopes were added to the hunt a few years ago I thought this was a great move and still do.I strongly support scopes on these guns and hope you keep them legal,Please listen to the public support and go the direction they support.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Stop trying to make it impossible to hunt. If you want to help the deer I'm great with an antler restriction. 3 points or better. Shorten archery hunt to 2 weeks, I know of multiple people that will shoot and wound deer each year. Eliminate scopes for muzzleloader hunts I grew up hunting open sights for the muzzleloader hunt and it was more challenging and more fun than now. Shorten rifle hunts, but do not take away scopes on rifles. All these things can be done state wide yesterday and I'll support it. Also stop killing the "urban" deer. Trap and transport them that'll help the herds out. We can stop pimping out Utah for the hunt expo every year and start a rotation with other states so we're not the only ones giving away all our permits. Also when I report hunters hunting on the rifle hunt with full camouflage and zero orange get officers out there enforcing the laws. We need people out enforcing the laws and we need people from the offices to care about the hunters as well as the animals. I know this is 2 years in a row someone in my family has made reports to the fish and game and we have never even had an officer call us to follow up or do anything about it.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Please please please get rid of scopes on muzzleloaders. Also I feel we need to outlaw the muzzleloaders where you load a powder charge into the breech. It should be a legal requirement for muzzleloaders to be loaded from the muzzle.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Great move. Requiring harvest reporting and a survey to give game managers more data to manage the herds is a move in the right direction.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Restricting the muzzleloader hunt is a great move. I've muzzleloader hunted with and without scopes. Today's muzzleloaders are capable of shooting over 400 yards accurately. Restricting the use of scopes will move the hunting parameters back to what a muzzleloader hunt used to be.  
Great move.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I think what will happen here is people who are ok to shoot a two point will no longer put in on points restricted units and it will make the remaining units harder to draw. As for the 5 day hunts I think most people hunt about five days anyways.  
These animals never get a break. We push from July til January and send them into winter stressed. Let's combine some hunts and start talking about guides and what they are doing to our herds and non stop pressure with 20 kids sleeping on one animal and harvesting only the largest animals and infrared optics.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

With all new technology the wildlife doesn't have a chance. Scopes on muzzle loading rifles just lets people dial their scope and shoot out to 1000 yds. I personally know of people shooting deer and elk over 800 yds all because of scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** 1 . Make Wasatch 3 point or better on deer . 2 . I think we as a team need to do more predator control. Dnr included . way to many predators . Bears/mountain lion/ coyotes .

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I agree with antler point restrictions but not the weapon restrictions

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do not agree with the proposal to remove the use of scopes on general season Muzzleloader hunts. The 3% increase in harvest is minimal and I believe more animals will be wounded with poor shot placement without the use of scopes. Also the hunting public has invested a substantial amount of money on the current weapons used that will be mostly unusable with these changes. (many guns are not drilled and tapped to accept open sights.)

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 12:06 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** you always want to take away but never lower the price of tags and we have spent money to buy gear for these hunts that we enjoy sounds like you only want the rich to participate

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Shorting season dates would not be relevant or make an impact or the amount of deer on the mountain. Make Wasatch west a 3 point or better unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Us hunters, want to ensure the accuracy by obtaining an ethical shot with harvesting an animal. Do not ban scopes on muzzleloaders as this could cause more injury and could cause an unretrievable situation of an animal. 3% increase of harvesting with a muzzleloader is not much of a difference so why make the change?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am for the point restriction to 3 or 4 point or better and allow the younger deer being harvested to grow a little more and have the ability to reproduce more youth. Also, I haven't thought much about the shorter season but the rifle wouldn't hurt. It has the most hunters in the field and allows for two full weekends where the muzzleloader only allows for one weekend.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I am against the scopes on muzzleloaders and not for helping the hunter to be more accurate but because of the wounded animals that will now be shot at distances just because hunters had done it in the past. Scopes can be unfair but they are also ethical and cleaner kills for the animals.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 10:50 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 10:52 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 10:54 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly disagree with the removal of scopes on all muzzleloader hunts. This is simply an attack directed at hunting under the guise of the "technology committee". If scopes only improve deer harvest by 3% then the technology advantage would not effect the fair chase aspect. The technology committee was supposed to be created to ensure that technology used while hunting did not give the Hunter an unfair advantage eliminating the fair chase aspect. Furthermore removing scopes will just result in more wounded animals not being recovered.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

do not remove scopes from muzzleloaders. go to a fixed power only scope on a muzzleloader or make it so youth can use scopes. taking them away will be a huge disservice to youth hunters. we have scopes on all our muzzle loaders and have not taken a shot past 75 yards. the scopes make it a lot easier for a youth or any hunter to make a better, more accurate and ethical shot. going to open sights will greatly decrease their chance of success, increase the chance of wounding an animal and make it a lot harder for inexperienced hunters to be successful, even within 100 yards.

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I believe the mandatory reporting will be beneficial in many ways and most importantly giving more accurate harvest statistics year over year. My one concern is if you ever went as far as the coyote reporting process where gps coordinates were required when reporting. That would make it possible for public gramma requests to seek locations of harvest for big game and that would not be something I would want to see become public domain data. There are too many companies/services that would use that, including individuals, and would give up information on areas people have put a lot of effort into finding and scouting.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 9:03 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The public shouldn't have to buy new guns every time you people change your minds

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I have had two dedicated tags in the past 6 years, and I like the changes that are being proposed here. My biggest feedback on the program is that there needs to be better and more opportunities to provide service hours, especially considering the doubling of the cost per hour that just occurred. When I first signed up I assumed there would be projects that are connected to the land and species management like installing water tanks, planting sage brush, helping animal counts, darting/relocations, but in reality many of the posts are for tradesmen (welders, electricians, etc.), helping events, proving equipment, and if there are any landscape based options they may be several hours from your home (ex- hardware ranch every year) but you do not get any credit hours for your transit time.

I have talked with Bryan about this and appreciate the complex situation with federal v state land management, but it seems all the most rewarding project work is subbed out to the non-profits who in return get many high value tags to auction off at their membership party events. I would like to suggest that the state look to requiring the project applications from these groups to have enrollment opportunities for the dedicated program, similar to a federal set-aside. Not only would it open up better quality projects to the program, it would be mutually beneficial in increases enrollment in those non profits once a dedicated hunter works with them and learns more about who they are and what they do. I began volunteering at Lee Kay after getting to do hours as a range officer, so I know there can be mutuality.

I'll sneak in my hope that the program would move to 3 bucks instead of 2 out of 3, but that's more lofty then the topic I addressed above.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

You just charged the rules on scopes for muzzleloader less than 10 years ago, you opened the floodgates to people buying long range muzzleloader rifles and long distance scopes, and now want to tell them it gives them too much of an advantage? You stated statistics show only a 5% increase in harvesting when using a scope; then why bother changing it? This seems like a lot to change for very little upside benefit.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 10:30 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I don't understand why you would change things now. I enjoy hunting with the MZ and more so since we could use a scope since my eyes aren't what they used to be. You still only get one shot.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 10:49 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

With an increase success rate of roughly 3% with muzzle loaders, cannot be totally contributed to the use of scopes. Bullet Technology has increased to be more effective, I believe, scopes, and bullet technology have led to better success rate, and 'Less Wounding' rate. I believe talking to Hunters in the field and how I felt myself, is we try harder to find a mature buck, rather than taking a smaller one because we feel more restrained to 100 yards or less. Also my experience with talking to hunters in the field, they had wounded a deer and couldn't find it back when only a one power scope was allowed. Which could be the scope issue or bullet issue.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I'm all for the mandatory harvest reporting. The data probably won't change, but the public confidence will.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I really like the idea of trying some new hunting strategies. A major concern I have is the lifetime license holders grabbing a huge majority of the tags in the 4pt or better units. Pine Valley already has about 500, and I think it will more than double. I think there should be some sort of cap, similar to the Dedicated Hunter Program, around 15% or so.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

So, the technology committee recommended to restrict the use of range-finding bow sights that cost \$800-\$1,000. A small percentage of archery hunters were using these and were affected by the change. On the rifle end of things, riflescopes that do similar things were restricted. The Burris Eliminator (\$1,500+) and the Swarovski DS (\$4,000+) are the only two mainstream scopes that do that. Again, very few people were affected by this change, with the vast majority of hunters using regular scopes with a turret/dial system. Almost EVERY muzzleloader hunter in the state will be affected by this proposal, and per the DWR's own survey data, there's "Not a lot of support for change". Also, no majority was in favor of the muzzleloader sight restrictions, the majority was in favor of the status quo - their words! So who is really pushing for this? If someone is looking for a "unique experience", what is stopping them from using iron sights right now? It doesn't make sense to me to make such a drastic change, without majority support.

The survey says that "Most people aren't comfortable harvesting animals beyond 200 yards" That's because most people are still in the 200-300 range, and I know a LOT of people with long-range muzzleloaders capable of shooting a long way. People like to be accurate and ethically harvest animals! Was that not even part of the conversation? Do we purposefully want to reduce people's accuracy and effective ability to cleanly and quickly harvest animals? I don't think it's a good idea to go backwards there.

Here's the big issue I have and I would like the RAC and Board to discuss:

The committee recommends that we restrict the optics that allow muzzleloaders to shoot similar distances to rifles. What are we doing to restrict the optics and sights on archery equipment that allow them to shoot more than 100 yards, crossing into muzzleloader territory? Shooting those extreme distances with a bow is far less accurate, predictable and ethical than some shooting 500 yards with these new muzzleloaders. And people ARE doing shooting those extremely long-range bow shots, because their sights allow for it! If you surveyed the general hunting public, a HUGE majority would say that people should not be shooting 100 yards (or more) with their bows. If we are going to restrict these weapons, let's do it equitably and fairly. Let's not pretend like archery hunters are exempt from their weapons pushing the limits of an effective and ethical range. No preferential treatment.

I respectfully request the RAC's and Wildlife Board seriously discuss and vote on restricting archery sights to a maximum of 5 fixed pins and NO SLIDING or ADJUSTABLE SIGHTS. And only then I will be in favor of the proposed muzzleloader restrictions. Principles matter.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Not much to say on the Limited entry stuff, but I think the general season landowner tags should be left they way they are. (And I do not participate in the program). Some units will naturally be more desirable, that is to be expected and okay in my opinion.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I completely disagree with this proposal. My entire family has hunted most of these units for 50+ years. There have been good years and bad years, but this research proposal is nothing more than pretext to eliminate additional opportunities in an effort to create "de-facto" limited trophy opportunity at the expense of all the hunters who probably missed this proposal since it came out during the general season deer hunt! DWR needs to remember that they work for the general hunters, not research institution and definitely not politicians who are trying to force limited hunting on working Utahans.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The data does not support this recommendation. The technology committee's own mission and mandate do not support this. Members of my immediate and extended family were appalled by this recommendation. Removing scopes will cause more wounding loss. This recommendation should not be supported by the wildlife board and RACS. We, the hunting public, had already felt like DWR listened to the public when scopes were put on muzzleloaders. And now, here we are, just a short time later and the government is trying to further restrict hunting opportunity without any data supporting the recommendation. This action is arbitrary and unnecessary. Strongly disagree.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Why has this not been done in the past? This is a must and needs to be done immediately.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** With the shorter seasons, are hunter going to be running into problems with area being overcrowded with a shortened hunt? Should Utah consider an early and late hunt for weapon types to mitigate overcrowding and hunt satisfaction. I know I tend to go into the field when the crowds have died down. The change being presented ensures the shortened hunts will have overcrowding issues and decreased hunter satisfaction levels.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** We are far past the point of a traditional muzzleloader hunt. If you want to keep the hunt traditional don't allow inline muzzleloaders. The data saw a very very slight increase. You'd be better off implementing the mandatory reporting to get actual harvest numbers to make a more educated decision in the future. Perhaps with the shorter season dates that are being proposed this could be an opportunity to have a tradition muzzleloader hunt (non inline/non scoped hunt) followed up with a current muzzleloader hunt (inline, scoped, saboted). That would be more telling about success rates and wound rates.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Your own survey showed that over half of respondents didn't want this change. The distinction between muzzleloader and any legal weapon shouldn't be the sighting, a muzzleloader is essentially a single shot, whereas the majority of rifles provide easy follow-up shots. Additionally it wasn't that long ago that sighting options changed from 1x scopes to magnifying scopes. I personally will be upset, as I am sure many other hunters will as well, if I now have to go out and purchase a 3rd sighting system to participate in the muzzleloader hunts. If the majority of hunters want to leave things as they are, why are you disregarding the feedback you sought and received

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I believe that if you are going to use surveys you should take the feedback received. A majority of hunters would like to keep scopes on their muzzle loaders. We just recently changed to allow scopes which has been welcomed with open arms. I do not want to purchase a third set for sighting my weapon. I see that you provided that scopes only increased the success 2.6% however I wonder if that data calls into question the amount of deer wounded and not retrieved comparing sights to scopes or comparing the shooting distance. I think the risk for severely wounding an animal but being unable to retrieve is greatly increased, by only having Iron sights. I implore you to gather more data and I implore you to listen to the feedback of those in the field.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Should have been in place years ago!!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am not in favor of restricted weapons. I am getting older and have hunted and contributed to hunting for nearly 50 years. I plan on hunting until my health prevents me from doing so. I don't have the \$\$\$ to go out and buy new weapons !! I am in favor of APR, if it is managed correctly.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** You will never change technology! Technology is and has been driving the future for years! Eliminating technology will not change anything as per hunting!! Please give me one factual data point on how removing trail cameras has helped hunting/wildlife!! Removing optics from weapons will only result in wounding more animals! If anything, technology has made hunting more ethical by improving accuracy resulting in more clean and humane kills.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I like the idea of running some trials to see what works and what doesn't, but I do have a few concerns about these proposed studies.

1. Antler Point Restriction - I am concerned that the 4 point or larger requirement will promote 3 point genetics to thrive in the population over time. I would prefer 3 point or larger as the antler point requirement.
2. Shortened Season Dates - I don't have a huge issue with this, but I would rather see the hunts split into multiple shorter seasons. For example 1st Archery - Aug 24th to Sep 6; 2nd Archery Sep 7 to Sep 20.
3. Weapons Restrictions - I am not interested in going back to 19th century technology for hunting. I am fine with the current restricted weapons hunts as their own separate thing but would not support these restrictions spreading to all hunts.
4. Regarding the units selected for the trials, I would like to see some units in other areas of the state included in the study as they may react differently than those units in the south.
5. One issue that I notice more and more each year is how much harder it has gotten to locate bucks in the backcountry while at the same time there are more and more each year right in town. The DNR needs to work closer with municipalities for solutions to move the deer to where they are huntable. Smart bucks will live where they feel the safest which used to be as far from roads as they can get but more hunters are willing to hike into those areas than ever giving them no safe place on the mountain. They have figured out that they are safe in town so they stay there year round.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

My first issue with this item is that you just recently decided to allow scopes on muzzleloaders, so everyone went out and purchased new scopes, now you are saying take them off. Don't waste our money please. I am not one of those that takes 500 yard+ shots with my muzzleloader but do like the added confidence of being able to see my target clearly for a 150-200 yard shot. The presentation showed the harvest success % difference was fairly minimal with scopes and most hunters are not taking shots past 200 yards anyways. If we want to make changes to our hunts because other states do it differently then lets talk about the spike elk hunts.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Harvest data will be useful in measuring hunt quality. Antler points for each harvest report would also be helpful information to determine age class of animal and hunt quality.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Antler restrictions would be great! Apply this to all general season units with the exception for youth to harvest any legal buck. This provide opportunities for youth while managing mature bucks. Season: Archer=2 weeks, muzzleloader and rifle 5-7 days. Multiple rifle hunt dates with the same number of tags. (Similar to Colorado and Arizona). Less crowded=better hunt quality. Compound bows should be allowed state-wide, archery is a challenging hunt already. In-line muzzleloaders should be allowed.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** According to the data provided most people would not shoot further than 200 yards so I don't think the impact isn't that great using scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Online reporting would be great and you would get unbiased data.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

<b>Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b>	I agree that Landowners need to hunt on private land only if that is the tag they are issued. Permits should not be sold by the landowner. Hunting is turning into a wealthy person activity rather than providing equal opportunities.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?</b>	Somewhat disagree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?</b>	LOA should be put into a drawing like the rest of the public and not resell permits. Those permits can be distributed to family members.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?</b>	Somewhat agree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?</b>	CWMU are for great for providing quality hunts and provide opportunities for public drawing.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Thank you for thinking outside the box and trying things to make it sustainable for future generations. I would like to see a balance of trophy and opportunity a crossed the whole state.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I agree. But We keep adding restrictions on weapons that are already restricted. What are we going to do with rifle restrictions. I have seen many hunters in the last few years think they can shoot long range.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** It doesn't take long to do the harvest reporting and it helps with choosing hunts for the next year and for implementing needed changes to certain areas. I really like the mandatory reporting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am all about trying things to increase the deer population and stabilize it. I watched the big game meeting last year, and some of these were brought up. I worry about the shoot first count points later mentality that would lead to more bucks shot but less meat used, but I think you are in a hard spot as you try and figure things out. I look forward to seeing the data and seeing what it tells us.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** This one is tough for me...not sure exactly how I feel

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 5:19 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I fully agree with mandatory harvest reporting! I like what is recommended.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am not a fan of doing antler point restrictions even though I dont hunt the southern units. It Seems complicated, and would lead to wasting game. Let people hunt a small buck if they want to. Example: youth may want to harvest thier first buck even if its small or another hunter may just want a meat buck.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I have no problem with removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I would like to see either open sites or limit to 1 power scope. I am a muzzleloader and rifle hunter. I believe It would maintain the fair chase concept. I highly recommend we look at the long range rifle shooting as well next year. As it seems an unfair advantage to wildlife to shoot them from really long distances. Long range shooting is changing hunting. I saw that first hand this year with everyone hunting from roads and not "hunting" down in the canyons where I hunted. I support the recommendations.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I agree that the recommendations would be good for DH program.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Hunting isn't all about killing or harvesting. A shortened season is going to cram more people into the few available days to hunt. The second half the archery, muzzleloader, and rifle deer hunts are never as crowded as the opening weekend. I have four sons. Between junior high, high school and college schedules it doesn't always work to go opening weekend. Some of my boys will just miss out due to such a shortened season. Shortening a season won't increase hunting opportunities, it will decrease them.

The antler restrictions will also decrease opportunities and in essence create limited entry hunts on these general units. If people are interested in four point or better opportunities, why not call it what it is and create a new limited entry opportunity. Or create more hunts like the limited entry muzzleloader deer hunt that takes place in November on general season units. If many of our general units are turned into four point restrictions (limited entry now) the other general units will be become more difficult to draw.

I don't see any proposals that are creating more opportunities for youth hunters. Competing with video games, i-phones and everything else is a challenge. When you take a 12 or 13 year old out and give him the opportunity to shoot a yearling buck, there isn't another hunter who is more excited. If you are going to change regulations to accommodate more trophy hunting, there should be some exceptions for young hunters. Give the the youth tags that allow them to shoot smaller bucks, even in these 4 point or better units. Give them the opportunity to hunt every year they are under 18. I have had kids so excited to hunt that don't draw tags and the next year their interests have changed. Please give the kids opportunities to hunt smaller bucks.

In addition, weather is a big factor in hunting. Both for success rates but also for enjoyment of being out with family. Some years 2-3 days of your hunt could be socked in with a storm making hunting difficult and camping miserable.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I don't understand why the recommendation is to remove scopes. The presentation indicated that most shots aren't past 200 yards and that the success rate has only increased by 3%. The survey showed that muzzleloader + hunters and Muzzleloader only hunters were 60% opposed and 56% opposed to having only open sights. Add in the neutral and you have 72% and 71% that are opposed or neutral to Open sights only.

When asked about limiting scoped to one power over 50% were opposed or neutral

Asked about keeping things status quo - 74% and 72% were supportive or neutral.

Why then would you do opposite of what feedback was received from the survey?

It seems like hunter feedback doesn't matter. You clearly conducted a survey with a good sample size and gathered the data from different groups. However it doesn't seem to be looked at objectively.

Significantly more people want to leave scopes, including variable power scopes and leave a separate hunt with the status quo.

It seems like the push is due to other states not allowing scopes. As a Utah resident it seems silly if our rules are dictated by other states.

The pendulum seems to have went far from 1X scopes to anything goes and now a proposal for no scopes. I think the rule should say as is, or compromise with a fixed 4X scope.

I have hunted in Utah with a muzzleloader for the last 20 years. In my opinion it is the best hunt. Prior to allowing variable scopes the 1X or red dot scope rule was great. I wasn't very happy in 2016 when variable power scopes were allowed. However, my stance has changed after using the scopes the last 7 years. It has made the hunt amazing. I have 4 sons. 3 of them are fair weather and social hunters. They don't like the rifle hunt due to all the people and never seeing deer (and being cold, they are a bit whimpy!). Allowing scopes has made them like hunting because they can use a muzzleloader now! It's their favorite weapon. We still have to stalk deer some, but they can shoot at 200 yards now and use the scope. Changing to no scope will either cram them back on the rifle hunt, or push them to stop hunting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I have noticed a lot of confusion with new elk hunters in Utah. It seems they are confused with spike only and any buy areas. I would love the survey to ask the general area of where elk is harvested or where they hunted if they were unsuccessful, to hopefully see if there is indeed as much confusion as I have seen.  
Now if we can also do away with multi season elk hunts, the overcrowding issues on muzzleloader and archery hunts will decrease.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I love the idea of No Scopes Allowed on muzzleloaders.  
Now if we can also do away with multi season elk hunts, the overcrowding issues on muzzleloader and archery hunts will decrease.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Eliminate guides and their 85 buddies, raise guide fees to 150,000 per guide, a year for your lost revenues from getting ride of private land owner tags and loa association, monitor the money more that's generated off public land guides

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Limit rifle technology , archery , more training for dumbasses that have no business shooting a weapon, more Leo , limit days of hunting , do away with early rifle hunt, cut tags in half for 3 years on all units , then do a soft start with youth , muzzleloader and rifle hunt 7 days , open sights for rifles also,

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** C

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** All limited entry loa need to go away just pay them a small fee , control private property hunting to only private property with gps location of kill site to verify was shot on there property eliminate guides

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** Just pay them and put in general tag draw

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Get rid of CWMU and guides kinda a [REDACTED] with the rules to hunt them

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Making mandatory reports is taking away freedom and additional charges for not filling them out is a terrible over reach - regardless of the goal here. This data isn't the area where true growth and change happens. It's in the weapon, tag, and technology restrictions. THAT will reflect the true data on your "counts" DON'T DO THIS.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I like the idea of having everyone report what they shot. That should really help everyone know what is happening on the mountain and how many deer and stuff gets shot.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am a youth hunter and just got into hunting with my dad. I don't like this idea. I think this will make hunting hard for me to do with school and stuff, and it sometimes will be hard to tell the difference between a 3 point and a 4 point and I just want to shoot a buck, not have to hold out for a big buck for my first Utah deer.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I am a "youth hunter" and just started practicing with a muzzlelodaer. They are hard to shoot already. Hard to load each shot. I have a hard time seeing the metal sights on my gun so my dad put on a scope. It is a small Bushnell scope but I can now see the target and I have been hitting the target. I don't think I can hit a deer with open sights. Please don't hurt my future and let me do what I have practiced for my deer hunt next year!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I've been muzzle loader hunting for many years. It is my favorite season to hunt. I was very excited when magnified scopes became legal. I'll admit that I was concerned about how it would change the hunt. Would it become too popular and crowded? Would the success rate jump drastically affecting the rifle hunt? According to the stats in this video, neither of these appear to be the case.

This year, I finally upgraded my muzzle loader and scope at quite a financial expense. After much practice and anticipation, I had a successful hunt. It was one of the most enjoyable hunting experiences I've had. As I get older, it is more difficult to see and use open sights. Scopes, combined with the more temperate weather of the muzzle loader season, allow older hunters to enjoy hunting into their later years.

The data seems to show that more than 50% surveyed want to leave the regulations as they currently are. I fall firmly into this group. Even modern muzzle loaders are much more difficult to hunt with than center fire rifles. I feel that a muzzle loader with magnified optics is the perfect middle ground in regards to effective range, difficulty, and success rate between archery equipment and rifles.

I urge the committee listen to the majority of hunters surveyed and allow the use of magnified optics to continue. Thank you.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 10:27 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

The Division has been saying for years that buck hunting doesn't affect deer populations. If that's the case, why does the memo say that this study is seeking to determine whether any of these hunting strategies will affect deer populations? Don't we already know the answer to that question?

We also already know the answer to the question of whether antler point restrictions will improve deer populations or result in more mature bucks. It's been proven time and time again - antler point restrictions don't do either of those things. I am adamantly opposed to antler restrictions.

I'm also wondering why Pine Valley was chosen as the unit for antler restrictions. We already struggle to keep the buck:doe ratio below 24 on that unit - won't it only go up from there with antler point restrictions?

Regarding antler point restrictions, I feel like the Division is simply giving up and caving to public pressure instead of sticking with the science. Going along with bad ideas just because a vocal minority keeps bringing them up is not an approach I want to see the Division take. When there's solid evidence to back your position up, please stick to your guns! The better answer is education. As a response to public feedback, I'd love to see the Division put together a brief paper (with links to sources for further reading) that explains the history of antler point restrictions in various western states, and what the outcomes have been. I'd like that much more than three years of reduced hunting opportunity just so the Division can turn around and say, "I told you so!" when the predictable outcome occurs.

I also struggle to see why permit numbers need to stay the same from year to year on these units. If we want a fair comparison to other units, shouldn't we treat them like other units?

I'm open to trying shorter seasons and restricted weapons.

One important detail that needs to be clarified is whether a person who draws an archery permit on a restricted weapons unit would be allowed to hunt the extended season with regular archery equipment (compound bows). I would happily apply for one of those units as a second or third choice just so I can hunt the extended, even though I would have no intention of actually hunting on the restricted unit at all. Hunters who do that will skew your application data and give a false impression of interest when their actual interest is on an entirely different hunt in an entirely different part of the state. In my opinion, the best answer to this is to offer unlimited extended area permits that people can apply for as a second choice. I'm pretty sure that idea is in the deer plan. Why hasn't it been implemented?

I acknowledge that the Division has an extremely difficult job, and can't keep everyone happy. I appreciate your good work and efforts to increase hunting opportunity.

---

<b>Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?</b>	Somewhat disagree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?</b>	I would prefer to see one power scopes allowed on muzzleloaders. I support the other recommendations.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?</b>	Neither agree nor disagree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b>	Somewhat disagree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b>	<p>I do not support a special drawing for landowners on large units without an LOA. They've already got lots of ways to benefit from public wildlife (CWMUs, private land only cow tags, trespass fees for hunters, etc.). I don't see why they need more at the expense of the average public hunter.</p> <p>I'm not sure I understand how taking 10% of general deer permits away from the regular draw and selling them OTC to landowners is supposed to improve my odds of drawing a remaining general permit. Especially when they can be sold - I'll bet landowners will snap them up to make money. Pretty sure it would just make the landowners' odds better and make mine worse. I don't support that either.</p>
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?</b>	Neither agree nor disagree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?</b>	Neither agree nor disagree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?</b>	Thanks for your efforts to increase transparency and public benefit.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I agree with the proposal to remove scopes from muzzleloaders. The intent of the muzzleloader hunt is to hunt deer on an even playing field with weapons that required you to truly hunt. The modern ML's have become as advanced or more than most rifles and as a result, more mature bucks are being taken due to the longer ranges at which the high tech muzzleloaders can shoot.

I also recommend similar restrictions to rifles. I have witnessed this past season where hunters were shooting at deer over 1500 yards across massive drainages and canyons. Due to the distance, the hunters never made the effort to check to see if the deer was hit or wounded. This would have required much time and effort to hike over the the area to check if the big game was hit our wounded. In most cases, hunters will not make the effort. This is not hunting! It's impressive that a rifle can shoot that distance, but big game should not be their target. I would recommend either the technology that is needed to shoot those distances is restricted or a distance restriction be implemented.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 11:00 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

The archery changes are fine.  
I disagree with the muzzleloader scope changes. If it has only increased chances by 3% why bother changing it? I like the addition of the scope, this gives me greater confidence in making an ethical shot. I don't shoot over 150 yards and the ability to see my intended point of impact gives me greater comfort in knowing my shot will be exactly where I aimed. Dave H

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I rarely choose "Strongly Agree" on survey's, however, I like the changes included. Especially to the mandatory reporting requirements. I believe that this will help the DNR allocate specific resources to areas that are struggling, and help maintain areas that are meeting the standards for habitat, wildlife population, and hunter success. Seeing that there are rules set in place to make the reporting requirement have essential accountability and responsibility from hunters to participate to help the DNR manage the wildlife in the state.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

I don't know the logistics that go into deciding where augmentation sites are placed. I imagine it requires habitat available, food sources and water sources. My first question is on the San Rafael unit, why are the augmentation sites closer together? From the map shown briefly in the video it appears that these sites are a lot closer together in relation to the units shown. Second question is, what man made resources will be placed in these units? Artificial water sources i.e "guzzlers", what amount of animals will be tagged or collared, will there be special focus on breeding and repopulation, and will there be additional Antelope transplanted into the unit, if so, from where and how many?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I understand making certain changes to improve wildlife and hunter satisfaction. However, I don't agree with all the muzzleloader restrictions. I agree removing any optic site from all muzzleloaders will be better for the hunt. I believe the reason people like to hunt archery and muzzleloader, is because people like the chase and more of the traditional way of harvesting an animal. In my opinion still allow inline muzzleloaders, and don't allow models like the CVA Paramount or anything that has a bolt action loading system on the muzzleloader. I don't agree with the archery restrictions proposed, removing the ability to hunt with a compound bow is asinine. I say that because it was mentioned in the video about decreasing illegal harvest or wasteful killings. Hunting with a traditional recurve is not very popular, people that want to archery hunt these units will either venture else where to hunt or attempt to hunt with the appropriate equipment. In doing so I think the number of wasteful kills would possible increase due to poor shot placement and hunters losing the animals. Aside from the small population of sportsmen that use a traditional recurve bow I don't believe this change would help improve the unit, it would cause additional strain and hunting pressure on other units in the state. I wouldn't be apposed to antler restrictions being placed on most hunting units throughout the state. I believe it would require more work from the hunter but would increase hunter satisfaction.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Again I find myself choosing "Strongly Agree," I fully support changing the optic regulation for muzzleloader hunting to just iron site or peep sites only. I still believe keeping inline muzzleloaders available to use, and not allow any muzzleloader with a bolt action like the CVA Paramount and similar models.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I added comments to the Utah wildlife board page

I do not agree with taking scopes off of muzzleloaders, in the same way that compound bows have made hunters more precise and ethical, scopes on muzzleloaders have done the same. Less wounded game, better shot placement, better sight picture, more success for kids to find game in the scope and get opportunity. I felt like over the past few years that having scopes on muzzleloaders has all but eliminated the days when I first started muzzleloading

1. hoping your bullet will hit where you want but it usually did not
  2. not being able to see your target
  3. taking unethical shots because of #1 and #2
  4. 100 yard range
  5. challenges for kids
-

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I am strongly in favor of mandatory reporting. Additionally, I think it would be useful to require reporting on the number of points on the harvested buck like Idaho does.

Anyone who can navigate the application process should easily be able to navigate reporting and having a grace year where there are no fines is more than generous and will give people an opportunity to understand the process.

The data gained from mandatory harvest reporting is easily accumulated with today's technology and the data will be extremely valuable to both hunters and wildlife biologists.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I am in favor of antler restrictions. The data on western mule deer is shaky at best, however, implementing it on a unit by unit basis will allow the wildlife biologists and wildlife board to determine the effects of the restriction before applying them to more units.

I am unsure on shortened seasons. Hunters are only given a few days afield as it is, the potential to only have one weekend to hunt or possible no weekends of hunting would be a blow to hunting opportunity. Additionally, it will increase hunting pressure during those days and decrease hunter satisfaction.

I am not in favor of the restricted weapons hunts. This seems like it will cause a lot of confusion about what weapons are legal and could result in a lot of people who do not understand what they signed up for. I thinking adding restricted weapons hunts is a potential solution, however, replacing the weapons requirements on those hunts will create a lot of confusion and many unsatisfied hunters.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have mixed opinions on scopes on muzzleloaders. I do not feel it is in the spirit of using a primitive weapon. However, I enjoy muzzleloader hunting and it is usually the season I dedicate the most time hunting. The data does not indicate significant increase in harvest with muzzleloaders, however, we as hunters know that it is easier and we can be more selective with the deer we take because we will have more opportunity to take deer within a reasonable range.

I have only looked at a few units and the data associated with them but the drawing odds for rifle hunts got better and the odds for muzzleloader hunts got worse when scopes were allowed on muzzleloaders. For me personally, as a muzzleloader hunter, I would rather there be no scope and have the opportunity to hunt more often with better odds. However, from a management perspective, it would spread hunters out and help decrease the effects of point creep on rifle hunt, which would allow a greater number of hunters to be satisfied.

I do not agree with the idea that the scope is what distinguished a muzzleloader from a rifle. Many people do not want to handle powders or pellets and are intimidated by doing so. Muzzleloaders take specific care to handle safely, require frequent cleaning, are inherently less accurate, and not as commonly owned as rifles. All of these are factors that keep the muzzleloader hunt unique from an any legal weapon hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I have participated in the dedicated hunter program twice and thoroughly enjoyed the program and the opportunities it provides.  
I believe all the changes would be positive for dedicated hunters.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 2:07 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Neither agree nor disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I would like to see a 3 point or better restriction put in place. From what I have seen the last couple of years, more and more people are being more selective and aren't taking yearling deer.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I feel that the technology board has run somewhat unchecked. They have made proposals in the past couple of years that I have viewed as decisions made prior to getting public opinion.

Based off of their own study and percentage rate, scopes on muzzleloaders increase the harvest success very little. While I would support primitive weapon hunts being opened for those who want to hunt with flint locks, recurves, ETC. I would like to see the muzzleloader restrictions stay as is. If a change must happen then I would support putting a cap on magnification as a starting point. The be all, end all approach is where I feel the public distrust and complaints have stemmed from.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 2:44 pm

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the technology  
recommendations?**      Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments  
about the technology  
recommendations?**      It would be awesome if you could remove Scopes and then also move the  
Muzzleloader hunt to November

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 3:48 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

When you look at the fact that scopes on muzzleloaders only increased hunter success by 2.6% it seems irrational that we would even consider disallowing scopes on muzzleloaders. There is nothing to be gained. This isn't going to increase any big game populations. I am over 70 years old and it is almost impossible to focus both the rear sight for a clean ethical shot at any animal. I see the changes in muzzleloaders, I actually did some shooting and testing of muzzleloaders for Tony Knight when he came out with one of the first inline muzzleloaders. With the old flintlocks or side lock muzzleloaders people took too many unethical shots just like they do now with the improvements and new technology. You just can't legislate common sense, ethics, or morals. We hunt spike elk with muzzleloaders and a scope really helps when you have an illegal two-point bull in the same herd and you are trying to make a shot and keep track of the legal bull. A scope also really helps to make a good clean shot in poor light conditions. I would hope that you wouldn't vote to disallow scopes on muzzleloaders but if you would like a good sense rule I would support a fixed 4 power nonadjusting scope. The one power scopes were actually worse than open sights, they made everything farther away than it really was, the reticles in them covered up most of the target and were really almost impossible to sight in at any distance at all. I was actually at the board meeting when there was still a two-board system when they made the motion for the 1 power rule. There was a guy on the board who was older and couldn't see very well and who loved to hunt with a muzzleloader he made the motion because he didn't think that he would have enough support to pass the scope rule and he didn't actually realize what a one-power scope was like.

If you go to a fixed four power or less that does not have an adjustable turret for yardage it will stop most of the people taking shots at the distance that are now claiming. The whole deal with taking these super long shots is being able to adjust your scope for yardage. When you can't compensate for the yardage by adjusting your scope it will make these long shots almost impossible to make based on the poor trajectory of most muzzleloading bullets.

I don't personally have one of these so-called long-range muzzleloaders and I don't plan to buy one. I keep my shots under 200 yards and most of the time under a hundred yards.

Please don't take scopes completely off muzzleloaders. It is hard enough to deal with the challenges that hunters of my age deal with when hunting but if you do think there needs to be a change go with the 4 power scope that I have described.

I was a southern region rac chairman for several years before I was appointed to the wildlife board and when I would see all these changes proposed every year it would make me sad when everybody thought that hunting strategies would bring our deer herds back and all the while they were ignoring or they were unaware that these rule changes about antler

restriction, shorting hunts, and cutting tag numbers weren't the problem of our declining deer herds. The plain and simple truth is that to increase deer we must have more fawns that survive to reproduce. Our fawn survival is way too low on most units. Just to maintain the deer at least a 65 fawns per hundred does post season. A lot of our units are under 45%.

Where we are under a buck-only rule there should be lots of deer around. trying to blame or restrict hunting won't bring our deer herds back.

Instead of fighting over hunting equipment or techniques let's work on getting our fawns to live and reproduce.

Thanks for your consideration and your willingness to sit on the rac and giving up your time to do something for wildlife.

Paul Niemeyer

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** I support the DWR recommendations for the Kimberly Beaver Mountain CWMU

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** We should always be reporting harvests

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Again less restrictions, let's keep hunting freedoms open.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Scopes on muzzleloaders should not be restricted. If anything restrict the bolt action casing muzzleloaders shooting 300-400 yards accurately. Scopes for the general inline are not an issue, muzzleloaders have had scopes for hundreds of years. Scopes are traditional if that's what you're trying to keep.

Let's quit making restrictions tighter and tighter and keep our hunting freedoms open.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** 1. The 4 point buck is a bad idea. You will just end up with a bunch of big 2 and 3 points passing on bad genes like the the book cliffs  
2 ending scopes on rifles is a bad idea. Limit them to 3x9 or 4x12 should do what you want. If you want real change in vehicles make them be in a hard locked case

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Should go further and make them cap and ball

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Need to make them hunt the general season to push the elk and deer out of private

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** We drive 6 hours to get to Escalante for the bolder/kaparowit unit with our trailers, limiting the hunt to 5 days isn't worth the drive. We paid a lot of money to have scopes put on our rifles and have them sighted in, it wouldn't be worth us removing our scopes just for this hunt. I think the above two items should be revoked. As for the restriction on antler points 4 is excessive, I think there should be a better a limit than antlers above the ear is necessary. I think 3 points on at least one side would be a good start to let the 2 points grow.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Shorten hunts help improve deer numbers.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Leave scopes on muzzleloaders. Nowhere near enough evidence to say they have caused a big enough impact on deer harvest numbers.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** They should only be able to hunt there property the permits are issued, for not the entire unit. If there aren't a certain number of deer on there property they shouldn't be granted landowner tags.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** All units in the state should have an antler restriction of 3 points or more for a 4 year period. After 4 years it should be re-examined and then rotated throughout the units every 3 years so that every three years the units have the chance to recover from everyone who shoots the first 2 point they see. I feel that this would give the units a chance to recover and grow each year in a way that they wouldn't otherwise. It would also bring back trophy potential to each unit. All units in the state need to have point restrictions for a period of time, not just some. Also limiting the length of archery seasons is a terrible idea because it would make the least difference of the three seasons.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I agree that there are people who are taking the optics on muzzleloaders way too far. I personally know people who have taken game at 600 plus yards with a muzzleloader since the optics rule was changed. But as your data shows that is a minimal amount of hunters and things have changed little as far as numbers of animals harvested.

Having worked in the hunting industry for nearly a decade I have spoken to hundreds if not thousands of people in person who hunt with a muzzleloader and the general consensus is that optics should be allowed but kept to a lower power scope. Most hunters realize that a muzzleloader is a limit range weapon and as such even those who put high power optics on their muzzleloader were limiting their shots to 200-250 yards. They generally feel that a higher power optic allows them to make a cleaner more ethical shot.

Personally I own a number of firearms with open iron sights to this day and with training can hit a pie plate at 100 yards. But if I grab one of my rifles that carries even a basic 3-9 power scope I can bring those groups under an inch. That makes the margins for error in a shot much less. I feel that your data on unrecovered or wounded animals is skewed because many people don't want to be honest about the fact that they may have hit multiple animals in a season and couldn't recover them.

I believe that if people were honest your data would be much different in the numbers of animals wounded with iron sights versus those wounded with scopes.

My recommendation is that optics should be limited on muzzleloaders to 3-9 power scopes or lower on the magnification rather than eliminating their use. It makes more sense from an ethical standpoint as well by delivering a more accurate killing shot rather than using an iron sight that at 100 yards covers a deer or antelope entirely making it a minute of deer gun rather than 1-2 MOA gun.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 8:54 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** I think it is great to be able to hunt on private land in Utah.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Point restrictions should not come back. The other options are good to look into.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** About time. The success rates are higher than 3 percent and people are targeting mature bucks. A 1x scope would be ok, but no more magnifying scopes please.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Giving landowners more tags takes away from the public. Deer killed on private land also live on public land.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** This is just catering to special people.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** CWMUs take more than they give.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I hunt primarily to get meat. This is the same purpose behind hunting for thousands of years. I don't want to see us moving in a direction of allowing hunters to only harvest bucks of a certain maturity. Let each hunter find and choose the buck they want with the tag they have. Let the spirit of hunting (for the purpose of obtaining food) always be the primary driver.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Please leave the muzzleloader hunt alone as is. According to your data in the video the majority of muzzleloader hunters (whose opinions should carry the most weight) want things to stay the same with their hunt. And if buck harvest is barely different at +2.6%, then I'm not seeing the consequence of leaving it as is. There's a perception that it could get out of hand... but it's not. Your own survey shows that hunters choose NOT to shoot beyond 200 yards even with magnifying scopes. The DWR claims it's a science-driven and data-driven agency, but I don't see the reasons here to make changes. It seems the deer committee is simply trying to push through their own personal opinions here. Only 7 years ago the board voted to allow any/all scopes on muzzleloaders which was a controversial decision. Now without any real data people are trying to reverse that decision. I still have my 1x power scope from back then because I anticipated this would happen. Please make a data-driven decision and then leave it alone. Stop swaying back and forth as new people with different opinions occupy seats of authority and influence. Seems kind of random to limit hunting advancements one doesn't use while leveraging others to their fullest extent. Why not seek to limit the advancements in compound bows? Rangefinders? Spotting scopes? Two-way radios? Deer are being watched by dozens of people from 2 miles away as they guide their friend in for a stalk. Is that ethical?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Rather than allowing people to pay if they neglect submitting their harvest surveys, just stop them from putting in the next year. Period.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Point restrictions don't work. You're promoting inferior genetics in the mule deer population. Big two and three points will start being the norm. Not every deer will ever be a four point.

The data from the Oquirrh Stansbury unit when the rifle seasons were shortened actually showed increased harvest, and increased hunting pressure. I believe we'll see the same thing here.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I do not in any way, shape or form, support taking scopes off of muzzleloaders. I believe regulations should be made based strictly upon biological needs, not social concerns. Putting scopes onto muzzleloaders hasn't increased harvest. Taking them off won't increase tag numbers. If you want to use a scope, use it. If not, don't. I feel like this move is catering to the minority of hunters who want it.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 10:54 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I think removing scopes from muzzle loaders at this point will create more issues with hunters shooting game without the necessary accuracy and will have more wounded game. I know what they said on the survey but only 25% responded to the survey which is poor at best participation. Those that did participate are not going to report that they wounded game. If the harvest numbers are up with scopes, then reduce permits to reflect what you want the harvest to be but going backwards with technology is not the answer. The other thing I think this will do is push more hunters back to the already overcrowded rifle hunt. Thanks for your time.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I'm glad the division is open to trying ways to protect the few deer that are left. I also realize there are many many factors that go into these recommendations. Now the reality of last year and the bad winter, if you don't put a hard line NOW we will not be hunting deer anywhere in our state , because there won't be any. I'm old enough to remember when the book cliffs and the Vernon were closed for 5 years. then opened as a limited entry. Also back then that was to continue when the regions were split up, and was going to continue. why Didn't it? its in the same article of the guy sitting at strawberry and coming up with spike elk hunt. I'm 51 years old and this won't affect me, but could pay dividends in the future. I had my first deer public deer tag in about 15-18 years in the Manti unit! Close it to about 1 tag per 100 acres for a start, there aren't many deer left! And a ton of Hunters. Not everyone is going to like it, spend less time worrying if a muzzloader has a scope, and cut the tag numbers to let the few who have one harvest a deer. One dead deer is still dead whether its harvested with a bow, rifle, muzzleloader. If the tags were in line it wouldn't matter. This isn't a shot at the division, they have a tough job of trying to protect everyone. Ultimately its the board and the legislature. Please do something before they are gone!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Easy enough but this also shows me that there is NO herd counts done by biologist.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Its already known that too many permits were given out for the Randolph/Woodruff area. How about not over permitting a hunting area.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** This is a good start but what about reducing tags for the area? Going by an antler restriction, this has been done in the past and hunters complained of small deer being shot and left. So not so sure on a point restriction.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** At first I was unsure of this change. After being in the field and realizing that hunters are now making 7-800 yard muzzle loaders, this is no longer a muzzle loader gun. Its a .50 or .45 cal rifle as far as I'm concerned.

Another thing to think about may be to eliminate smokeless powder during the muzzle loader hunt. Only black powder or substitutes should be used. Not smokeless rifle powder.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

- Section 38-10 Certificate of Registration Extension:
  - o Revise the procedure for 1-year extensions given to Dedicated Hunters who draw a limited entry buck deer permit from the Utah Big Game drawing. This change would automatically apply a 1-year extension.

This I do not agree with. Kinda cake and eat it too. If they do dedicated then they should wait to draw an LE tag until after the dedicated is completed or if an LE tag is drawn, that is the same as the dedicated deer for that year.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Neither agree nor disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** See comments on Technology and hunting recommendations by Blair Stringham Thanks By the way, this type of approach and discussion is the same thing we were talking about 10 years ago on the RAC, same problem same solutions. The real solutions are much fewer permits, higher permit costs to the public

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** You can restructure the rules for scopes. range finders, all the technological requirements . It will still save a very small population of deer and elk. You should focus more on the number of permits issued for particular unit if you want to increase population numbers. I know its painful to lose revenue and your business model is then limited, but if you truly care about the increase of populations, that is the only way to have a dramatic increase. Then within a 3-4 year period the increase will happen and then you can begin to issue more permits for that unit. Biologists have known that for years but revenue always trumped this fact. All the restrictions on seasons, technology, scopes etc will NEVER help as much as this one thing, Fewer permits. but as long as the Division sees the demand for permits from the public they will continue to sell them. Part of the problem is the public themselves. When is doing what's best for the Resource more important than public or private wants. Thanks Richard Hansen please forward to Kent Hershey

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I was one of the members of the Central RAC when I proposed that the hours requirement be set at 24 instead of 40, John Bair 2nd the motion and it subsequently made it through the wildlife board at the present 32 hours. The program is good and the revenue is sufficient. I like the 6 hour requirement in the first year.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 2:01 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I have hunted the Boulder unit for my entire life. Your proposal would force me to buy a new Bow, new muzzleloader, and a new rifle. If your objective is force poor folks off the unit, you will meet your goals. Congratulations.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Antler point restrictions are a failed strategy. Who comes up with these ideas?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** My buddy shot his deer at almost 600 yards with a muzzle loader this year. Take scopes off muzzle loaders please.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Why change the limited entry rules?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** You run out of tags decide to give more to the private land owners and you run out of tags for the public but they have to wait. Sell off our wildlife even more.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory reporting should absolutely be part of hunting in Utah.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** We need more research and science-based information to help us understand what the deer population is doing, going through, and how to best manage it.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Applicable to the Boulder--- unit I agree that Archery and Muzzleloaders should have tech restriction BUT I think scopes should be allowed on rifles. Additionally long shots are generally required in the Parker Mt. regions on the Boulder unit. Scopes on rifles will continue to allow longer human kills.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I agree that Archery and Muzzleloaders should have these propose restriction BUT I think scopes should be allowed on rifles especially for youth, elderly and novice hunters.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am by your definition a veteran hunter. I have read and listened to all the information presented on this topic, in regard to scopes on muzzleloaders. I could not disagree more with your recommendations on the muzzleloader optic topic. I have no idea who you are polling or speaking to (the loud minority?) but I personally know hundreds of hunters who are dedicated conservationists and hunters and we are dumb-founded by this recommendation. Please leave the muzzleloader rules as they are. By your own research they are not giving hunters a huge advantage, but what good optics do provide is confidence. There are so many more problems to focus on when it comes to Utah's hunting problems. My grandfather, father, myself, and my sons could not be more disappointed in the direction the division is taking. Utah hunting is already miserable in many regards, please do not make it worse by following through with these proposals. So sad. Focus more of date restrictions and issuing fewer tags as opposed to going back to the Stone Age. Utah doesn't need to conform to other states, but maybe we could lead from the front with innovation and common sense. Not through feelings and sentimental values people place on the way things used to be. At the very least please conduct a new survey and poll 10x times the hunters that you have already polled. This study is not even remotely accurate based off the hundreds of hunters that I know and have spoken to.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

I watched the video and read the proposed changes. I agree with these changes as I understand them. But here is my personal experience. I drew the Diamond Mountain Limited Entry Muzzleloader deer tag this year. I found multiple hunters, who acquired landowner tags, hunting in the public areas. This was exceptionally frustrating as many of them had hunting guides that ignored common decency when it came to hunting (scaring deer off that their hunters could not get to, parking vehicles in roadways preventing access, etc). I hope these rules prevent this kind of behavior in the future so people like me can have a better experience after years of waiting to draw these tags. I am all for private property owners hunting their land, but their ability to access tags should not allow them to hunt on public property in any case.

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

There was no mention of predator control. I feel as if you need to make it easier on trappers so they can help control predators. You want us hunters to suffer because you protect the predators. You have low doe count and it's not the hunters killing them off, it's the predators.

I also feel as if you need to get the guides under control because I keep hearing other people talk about running into guides and I have too, that think they own the mountain and the game and treat us common hunters like dirt. We put in years for a tag and then we have to compete with these professional guides. Something needs to be changed. You guys forced all of these units on us and the hunting is worse than it's ever been in my lifetime of hunting. We just as well go back to a statewide hunt.

I also feel as if you need to change the draw system and draw once of a lifetime tags before limited entry tags because I don't think it's fair if you draw a limited entry tag you're kicked out of the once of a lifetime draw. We have paid our fee to be in that draw. I strongly don't think it's right. I feel as if the once of a lifetime tags should be drawn for first.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Going to iron sights on muzzleloaders I feel is a mistake. I feel the wounded rate will increase. With people trying to deal with open sights. Please consider limiting the scopes to 1 power which will help keep the wounded rate lower while limiting the range of muzzleloaders. Why do we care what other states are doing? Don't pick and Choose. We're the only state that has rifle elk hunt's during the rut???? There's no need to take muzzle loaders back to open sights. The increase in success rates with scopes is minimal. But I agree something needs to be done with the long range muzzle loaders. So limit scopes to 1 power.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I agree with the mandatory reporting. It's been needed for a while. I think the time frame for reporting is sufficient I do not agree with the fee or fine for missing the deadline. I think it's unreasonable to put money stress on people, especially in these days.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I agree with the shortened season dates. I however would like to see it across the entire state for the study period. You're proposing a study in areas that deer numbers are higher than the Northern regions. If you want to see if the study works, do it in areas where it will actually have an impact.

I do not agree with the 4 pt antler restriction. It makes zero sense to do a 4 pt antler restriction. 3pt or better would make more sense. We don't want a bunch of genetic, large 3pts running around breeding does.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I very, very strongly disagree with taking scopes of muzzleloaders. With only a 3% increase in harvest success, it makes no sense to remove them from a biological standpoint, pertaining to herds and management. You have already implemented primitive hunts which allow people who chose to hunt that way, can. Leaving scopes on give hunters another option to hunt in a way they like to or choose. Options are readily available for those who don't want to use scopes, they can hunt with or without should they choose.

It's frustrating to hear "recommendations" or "decisions" made from a technology committee that is heavily influenced by the SFW. We need to get rid of the technology committee and leave the recommendations and decisions to the RAC's and WLB. Those decisions need to be made off facts and real data not someone's opinion of how they feel about certain equipment. Our big game herds are not suffering due to scopes on muzzleloaders, trail cams, range finders on bows or rifle scopes. The harvest data shows quite the opposite. Especially with collared animals. Quit becoming a "police state" and worry about the actual biology of growing and maintaining herds for hunter success and opportunity. Who cares what other states are doing. Let's do Utah and manage herds the way they need to be managed.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

This is something that has needed to happen.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

Do away with CWMU's

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Do away with CWMU's. They were never meant to be a cash cow for private land owners selling the public's wildlife.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Thank you for finally trying something different.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I agree with the proposal scopes need to be removed from muzzle loaders. As stated as more and more people get their hands on long range muzzle loaders the problem is only going to get worse. From my understanding the Muzzle loader hunt was started to have a primitive weapon hunt and there is nothing primitive about shooting things at 900 yards away with a scoped muzzle loader you might as well just make a second any weapon hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is a long overdue change. A+

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I mostly agree with this proposal, but one area I am not in favor of is Antelope Island, I feel they need to get a handle on the very over abundant coyote population before putting more animals out there.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I commend the DWR for this out of the box thinking, and am willing to see how these proposals shake out.

A couple of issues that I am not a fan of, for the restrictive weapons hunts, I feel the archery restrictions are vastly over kill. Archery is already a very low success rate that I feel moving to long bow tech is to far. To me a fair restrictive hunt for archery would be to limit hunters to a 3 or 5 pin NON SLIDING site. to me this would help to reign in the archery equipment and lower success some. As I said its already very low compared to rifle and even muzzleloader.

I also feel that the muzzleloader restriction is to much, I feel that removing scopes as your have with rifles would be a fair take for that weapon type.

To me you went too far with your restrictive weapons definitions, I was ok with-it last year as a proposal, but only because I thought it would be used to add and additional hunt rather than completely replacing a hunt especially something as big as a whole general season unit.

One other issue, the proposed archery season is to start the first weekend in September, I feel you should keep the original start date in August as one of the draws to the archery hunt is hunting velvet bucks, if you move the hunt to September the velvet is not as pristine as it is getting ready to be rubbed off.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This is a very disingenuous proposal, all of the feedback shows that the majority of hunters, and especially muzzleloader hunters do not support this change.

This is not a biological issue, the success rate did not see a significant jump, I see no reason to change the current rules. Hunting with a muzzleloader even one of the new ones is not even remotely close to the same as hunting with a rifle.

The DWR, or the Tech committee never did give a good valid reason that they feel this rule needs to change. I fully reject this proposal and I hope that you on the WB will as well.

KEEP SCOPES ON MUZZLOADERS.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I agree with most of this, the only thing I do not like is them automatically adding a year to the program if the hunter draws a LE tag.

I personally had this happen to me as I drew a LE deer tag on the second year of my Dedicated hunters enrollment last year, this allowed me to be extra selective this year as I was able to hunt for a bigger buck this year knowing that if I did not kill one I could extend my dedicated to next year. But in the chance I did find a buck I wanted this year (which I did) I would still be able to use last year (the year I drew LE) as my no kill year. This allows me to now put in for a general hunt next year and either build a point or draw a tag.

Ultimately if you do this you will essentially be taking away a year of eligibility from the people that draw a LE tag while in the system. We all want as many years as possible to hunt, this rule would take a year away from someone depending on how it is implemented.

Everything else looked good.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

It does not say in this video, but in the new rules that passed last year, the people buying a voucher would have access to the entire LOA per the rule. I am wondering if that rule would still be in effect for Option 2 of the LOA rules?

Something to think about.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I feel the public hunters do not get enough of the tags, should be 20% go to the public.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 6:22 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** We need better draw odds to hunt.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 6:35 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**      Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**      The data dosen't support a need for a chane with optics. No more animals are being taken or harmed. Powder restrictions make more sense.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 6:41 am

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the CWMU**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Why place limits on what specific sighting technology, a hunter uses with a muzzleloader ? The only thing I see this doing, is limiting people with slipping, or slightly limited vision (yes, us older hunters), and increasing the probability of a missed shot/wounded animal. Is this because someone in an authoritative position decided "So and so does it" Clearly, the support for change is limited at best, at least amongst hunters. Technology changes, why can't the hunting community use it to it's advantage ? I get the impression there's other driving forces not mentioned in the video. As far as law enforcement, if they can't use the phone sitting right on their belt, or the computer in their car to look at the specs on a specific model scope on a muzzleloader if it's in question (why ?), they shouldn't be in police work (spoken from 25 years myself in the field as a police dispatcher). This overall, at least to me, sounds like a certain regulating authority thinks muzzleloader hunting should be a certain way, and I think that's wrong, and discourages people from participating in muzzleloader season that were perhaps primarily gun hunters. I am one of those people myself..

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I look forward to the mandatory Harvest reporting requirement. It will provide much needed data to make decisions based on facts.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I don't agree with some aspects of the restricted weapon hunts. I don't like the fact that you are completely taking away compound bows. That would be a very expensive investment I would have to make as well as a very long learning curve. Instead of outlawing compounds maybe you could just make a slight change and to the sight being allowed in the compound bow. Same concern with the muzzleloader definition. I would need to buy a completely new muzzleloader. You should still allow inline and something other than iron sights. Maybe go back to red dot scopes or 1x scopes for the fact that some of the newer guns don't come with iron sight options so that's another investment I would have to make, is getting my barrel modified to allow iron sights on both my muzzleloader and rifle... not a fan of that idea. I could get behind trying a antler point restriction but 4 point on one side seems excessive. To me that just seems like I'm gonna see lots of small bucks that are off the table and a lot more hunters because of the increase in tags for "increased opportunity "

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I'll start off by saying I dislike this new movement and find typing this as a waste of my time. Mainly because we fought to be heard about trail cameras and were completely ignored. We were happy with the compromise of just transmitting cameras being restricted. I was very disappointed when the proposal was amended at the very last minute to include all cameras. This was a hobby that my dad and I loved to do together when we didn't draw tags. Now we cannot do this activity. I feel like this committee is destroying my hunting/outdoor traditions. You're sample size of who you get data from is very small considering how many hunters statewide were actually have. Take the next 5 years and gather actual data from mandatory harvest reporting that have targeted questions regarding emerging technology before making any changes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 11:26 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I feel like you guys waste a lot of time and money on studies. if you want more bucks cut the numbers of tags, very simple.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 11:58 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

There is no evidence to push for this new ban. First, the studies you presented show that future tech has not greatly impacted harvest rate significantly enough to spur this change by stating harvest rate has only increased 2.6 percent with scopes on muzzleloaders. As stated in your key takeaways, "there is no significant change in success since adding scopes." In the end this is not a valid reason to take away scopes from muzzleloaders.

Along with that, your open sights only for muzzleloader slide and video brief, it was stated that more than half of muzzleloader hunters do not want muzzleloaders to be forced to be switch to open sights only. Making this change goes against what the people's opinion is.

Additionally, in the acceptable distance slide and video, you state that since muzzleloaders hunters don't shoot passed 200 yards they don't need a scope. Yes some hunters may be shooting at a general maximum of 200 yards, but if you take the scope off, you cut that distance to less than 100 yards due to it being a primitive weapon. The impact of this change will be much greater than what you seem to be acknowledging regarding distance hunters can shoot. Additionally, it takes time, dedication, and lots of practice for muzzleloader hunters to even be able to shoot accurately at a distance of 200 yards, even with a scope. If hunters are willing to put in that time, they should be rewarded for doing the hard work to achieve this.

Lastly, just because most western states don't allow scopes on muzzleloaders doesn't mean that is correct or that Utah has to follow that standard. This is not a valid argument for changing rules for a weapon type that already has a success rate that is minimally affected by the addition of a scope.

If you push this new ruling it will likely cause a good number of muzzleloader hunters to switch to a new focus of weapon system for hunting, such as rifle, me being one of them. Not all of the hunters, but enough to affect other weapon seasons. This will cause more overcrowding and pressure during the other seasons, and create a worse experience for the hunters.

Overall, this new rule to ban scopes from being on muzzleloaders should not be passed due to having no solid reasons to support the change.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I strongly oppose antler point restrictions. As noted in the video, when a Utah tried it in the past there was no increase in mature bucks, but rather an increase in poachers. APRs would force hunters to shoot the best genetics out of the herd and result in lower quality bucks over time, and there are plenty of hunters who would love to shoot a large two or three point buck.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The muzzleloader hunt has turned into a second rifle hunt. Although the video reported that hunters said they weren't comfortable taking shots over 200 yards, I personally know and have heard of many people taking shots on wildlife up to 400 yards with their muzzleloaders. Removing scopes will reduce hunter success, helping our deer herds. It may also allow for more tags to be issued to make up for the lack of success, increasing opportunity for hunters to get tags.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I do believe we should try and get more accurate harvest information, so the division can make changes based on accurate information.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The muzzle load hunts are unique no matter the scope you use. Its in the preparation and the reloading as they did hundreds of years ago. Trying to shoot out to 200 yards with iron sights your accuracy goes down. You need to have a scope to ensure an accurate shot at 200 yards. You seem to be set on that number 200 yards, but trying to shoot with an open sight that far lends itself to wounding more animals and not making a quality shot without a scope. We should want to make Utah a unique hunting state, not conforming to what other states are doing. We should leave the scopes as they are for muzzle load hunts. At the very least 3 power scopes. If you remove scopes the hunters will still shoot out to the guns limit, but wont be able to see to make an accurate shot, wounding more animals and decreasing our herds without harvest.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:45 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am writing in response to the proposed restrictions for optics on muzzleloaders. I did watch the video in its entirety, and I have some thoughts and concerns. I have hunted in Utah for over 40 years. I have used muzzleloader rifles throughout that entire period. I own and have used traditional TC rifles (cap and ball) as well as more modern in-line rifles. According to the data presented in the video, adding scopes to muzzleloaders insignificantly increases the harvest ratio, does not increase the wound ratio, does not increase the distance of the hunter taking a comfortable shot and therefore really has no scientific data to show that removing them entirely would have any significant effect except to appease a small fraction of people who are traditionalists or just don't like them or to match what other states are doing.

I would propose leaving the regulations as they are unless:

- 1) The scientific data shows an overwhelming advantage in harvest numbers.
- 2) The data shows an unacceptable increase in the number of wounded animals.
- 3) Biologists need to slow the buck harvest to increase buck-to-doe ratios or to help a specific area herd to recover. Make it a useful tool, like they are doing in our southern regions, not a blanket regulation.

As far as technology is concerned, I think it would be easy to argue that all methods have significantly increased over time, especially in the last 30 years. For example:

- 1) Compound bows have gone from 50-60% let off to 90% enabling longer hold periods.
- 2) Newer materials have shortened bows with higher speeds and less vibration.
- 3) Optics, specifically range finders, have dramatically improved accuracy and range.
- 4) The increase in the speed of compound bows allows greater arrow choices.
- 5) Rifles have also benefited from optic technology.
- 6) Rifle bullet technology has made effective shooting ranges more than double.

I respect that trying to effectively manage the states game animals is a daunting task and there are a lot of voices to be heard. However, I believe taking scopes away from muzzleloaders is the wrong choice and an ineffective rule with no real benefit for the wildlife at this point in time.

Sincerely,  
Robert M

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:49 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If your trying to take scopes off muzzleloaders, the any bull and spike elk hunts need to be before the [REDACTED] rifle hunts! Been hunting them for 2 days and can't get within 1500 yards of them, they've been chased to high [REDACTED] the last 2 months! Freaking rediculous! It's become the go to hunt because it's harder to draw deer tags now and everyone is buying elk tags. Bought my daughter an early rifle any bull tag and there were people everywhere.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I am adamantly opposed to this proposal for the following reasons:

**Antler Point Restrictions**

- Antler point restrictions have been tried before and been determined not to work.

- The silent majority of hunters are not trophy hunters. I have helped numerous adult onset hunters get started in hunting over the past few years. These hunters don't even understand the concept of trophy hunting.

They simply want the opportunity to harvest an animal and put meat in the freezer. In addition, who are we to tell other hunters, regardless of age, sex, or experience, that it is wrong to shoot a young/small animal?

Everybody has the right to enjoy the outdoors in their own manner. Neither is right or wrong, simply different.

- The units chosen for this experiment are currently experiencing tremendous survival and recruitment rates which has resulted in a lot of young buck right now. I am very concerned that this experiment will be viewed as highly successful, simply due to the current conditions on the ground, while the antler point restrictions had nothing to do with the increased number of larger bucks on the landscape.

**Shorter Season Dates:**

- Shorter season dates have been tried in the past, also with limited success in reducing harvest. In my opinion, a shorter season likely puts more pressure on the animals, as most hunters will take more time off for a short season vs a long season.

**Restricted Weapons**

- I'm not necessarily opposed to this concept, but I do not like it on general season units. Most people don't have weapons that fall into these categories. As we know, a lot of hunters are unit hunters (they have their favorite backyard unit). If your unit is one of these experimental units, and you don't have a legal restricted weapon, you're likely going to change units. This is going to have a negative impact on drawing odds for surrounding units.

- Given the very few traditional archery hunters in Utah, I am concerned about the sales of archery permits on the restricted weapons units. It is very likely that many of the archery permits drawn on restricted weapons units will be done so with the sole intent of hunting the Wasatch Front. This is going to skew the data about the popularity of these hunts.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I can support removing scopes from muzzleloaders, but I'm mostly indifferent. My biggest concern is that we land on a compromise of a low power (likely 4x) scope. IMO, this is the worst possible outcome. An experienced shooter can be as lethal at distance with a 4x scope as with a high power scope. Therefore, the 4x scope compromise would honestly accomplish nothing. This needs to be an all or nothing decision. Either remove scope entirely, or leave it as is.

Thanks for you time, service, and for reading all the emails, and good luck with your meeting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Having a scope on the muzzleloader gives the Hunter more confidence. This allows more people to consider this as an option for limited entry hunts. When you wait 20+ years to draw a tag you want to go into that year with whatever confidence you can. I know of 4 people that switched their limited entry choices because you could use multiple powered scopes. That helped with point creep on the any legal weapon. I would like to see other options for reducing point creep being proposed before we start making it worse with these changes.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I like restricting all forms of hunting together not just picking on one like the proposed change in the muzzleloader section and not bows. I like the restricted weapons one the most. Bow hunting has increased so much during my lifetime.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Bow hunting has increased so much during my lifetime. They wound so many more animals now that they are shooting 70, 100, and even 130 yards. please shorten the bow hunt by two weeks. anyone can walk within 100 yards of a deer in August when they are dumb. Give them a chance to put some more fat on them for winter. One hunter wounded 6 deer this year. we've shot 3 deer over the past while with arrows in them. One of them we shot because we saw the arrow and didn't want the animal the suffer anymore. It was shot through the jaw and couldn't open it's mouth to eat (very skinny). I don't believe that bow hunters report the animals that they wound accurately

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Please don't let land owners hunt on public land with their private tags or let them sell it to outfitters and then let them guide others on public land

---